

JPRS-TAC-86-032

11 APRIL 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

11 April 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet Weekly Discusses Gorbachev's Proposal, Security (Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, Nos 4, 7, Jan, Feb 86)	1
Nikolai Popov Article	1
Lev Semeyko Article	4
USSR's 'Top Priority' Program Contrasts Security Concepts (Pavel Kuznetsov, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 17 Mar 86)	8
Soviet Paper Contrasts USSR, U.S. Arms Curb Stance (Spartak Beglov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 20 Mar 86)	12
USSR Criticizes Allegations of Treaty Violations (V. Chernyshev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Mar 86)	14
PRAVDA Reports News Conference on Nuclear Issues (Moscow PRAVDA, 20 Mar 86)	17
USSR's Zamyatin Views Results of Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Leonid Zamyatin; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 1, Jan 86)	19
USSR's Lomeyko's 20 March Press Briefing Reported (Moscow TASS, 20 Mar 86)	24
Shevardnadze on U.S.-Soviet Relations During Poland Trip (Jerzy Wajszczuk; Warsaw Television Service, 20 Mar 86)	26
USSR's Ilichev Interviewed on Gorbachev Arms Proposal (Prague Domestic Service, 22 Feb 86)	28
USSR's Velikov Interviewed on Gorbachev Proposal (Brussels LE SOIR, 24 Jan 86)	30

Europeans Still Concerned About Implications of Zero Option (Jan Reifenberg; Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 11 Mar 86)	32
Soviet Ambassador Asks Brazil for Disarmament Support (Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO, 21 Mar 86)	35

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR's Semeyko Discusses European Security Problems (Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 19 Mar 86)	36
---	----

RELATED ISSUES

International Peace Meeting Held in Moscow (Moscow TASS, 16 Mar 86)	39
Gorbachev Receives Italy's Jotti, Views World Situation (Moscow TASS, 25 Mar 86)	40
USSR Views Reagan's Appeal on Defense Spending (Various sources, various dates)	41
'Confrontationist Rhetoric'	41
Congressional Criticism Noted	42
Further on Congressional Criticism	43
'Counterstrike' To Soviet Proposals, by M. Knyazkov	44
TASS: U.S. Congressmen Support Disarmament Appeal (Moscow TASS, 11 Mar 86)	45
'Unconstructive' UK Stance on Missiles Assailed by IZVESTIYA (Melor Sturua; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 19 Mar 86)	46
PRAVDA Hits NATO Short-Range Missiles Plan (Vladislav Drobkov; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Feb 86)	49
IZVESTIYA Editorial on Soviet Disarmament Policy (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 25 Mar 86)	51
USSR's Tolkunov Interviewed on Prevention of War (Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA, 11 Mar 86)	55
USSR's Zagladin Evaluates Results of CPSU Congress (Vadim Zagladin; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 10, 17 Mar 86)	59
Soviet Army Paper Editorial on Peace Efforts (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 18 Mar 86)	61
Soviet Journal Surveys World Events June-September 1985 (B. Bolotin, at al.; Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 10, Oct 85)	64

PRAVDA Publishes Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Communique (Moscow PRAVDA, 21 Mar 86)	74
USSR'S 'International Situation--Questions and Answers' 14 Mar (Konstantin Patsyuk, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 14 Mar 86)	79
USSR's 23 March Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' (Nikolay Agayants, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 23 Mar 86	83

SOVIET WEEKLY DISCUSSES GORBACHEV'S PROPOSAL, SECURITY

Nikolai Popov Article

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 4, Jan 86 p 5

[Article by Nikolai Popov]

[Text]

The Soviet proposals give us hope that in the 20th century the world will put paid to the nuclear race and will enter the new millennium free from the threat of civilization on Earth being destroyed. But to make real big steps towards disarmament, there is a need today, more than anything else, for political daring and a fundamentally new mentality consistent with the nuclear-space age.

For too long the countries possessing weapons of mass – and mutually assured – destruction have based their actions on the principle of ensuring "national security" by national means. But, considering the present-day level of the development of destruction means, security cannot be assured in a military-technical way. This is a political task and it can only be achieved by political means. If one speaks about the USSR and the USA, security can only be reciprocal and, in terms of the international community as a whole, it can only be universal.

It has happened on more than one occasion that initiatives in the field of arms control were made mainly with an eye to striking the imagination of world public opinion and in the hope that they will be unacceptable for the other side. In the nuclear age it has to be realized that the propaganda dividends from this logic and policy are too small in comparison with the

"effect of survival", for the attainment of which there is a need for specific and convincing steps, including unilateral ones, for persuasion by example, not by a challenge. In Mikhail Gorbachov's Statement it is emphasized that "ridding mankind of the fear of a nuclear catastrophe" requires "rising above national selfishness, tactical calculations, differences and disputes, whose significance is nil compared to the preservation of what is most valuable – peace and a safe future". Now is the time to make reciprocal steps in foreign policy, and proposals that take into account the interests and apprehensions of the partners in the talks – and in survival – and that throw bridges of hope across the gorges of suspicion.

Whereas cunning used for centuries to be the most revered art in world politics, while hypocrisy and diplomacy were seen as almost synonymous, now an era of frankness is

setting in in international relations even if in virtue of the extreme danger of the world situation.

Too often the discussions over international conflicts and problems and the talks on nuclear arms control have been characterized by an atmosphere of commercial transactions which are as old as the world itself: bargain more, prettify your commodity, sell a fake and cheat a partner if you can. Or talks like a card table. Playing at random, not showing up the trumps, bluffing and staking one's all – all these are from different games but the psychology is the same. In the statement by Mikhail Gorbachov it is stressed that the new Soviet proposals "do not attempt to outwit or outsmart the other side".

The problems of transforming mentality in the space era consist not only in the conservatism of human psychology. The arguments of what seems to be common sense often

come up against the mercenary interests or shortsightedness of definite influential circles in the world.

Whence the impediments!

In the West, especially in the United States, the Soviet side is often accused of having an oversimplified interpretation of political life in America – of "unjustifiably exaggerating the influence of the military-industrial complex". It is argued, in this case, that other influential forces are also active in the USA. Indeed they are, but isn't it the military companies that are planning to net at least a trillion dollars from the realization of the Star Wars programme? These colossal sums will provide the munitions industry with superprofitable contracts for the next 30 years! The first hundreds of millions are already flowing from this source and it is clear that the MIC is not going to voluntarily give it up.

These circles' thinking can hardly be called responsible or new – consistent with the nuclear age. Many of their spokesmen approach the question purely out of greed – the government wants to waste huge sums of tax dollars and it would be a crime not to pick them up. After all, if we don't get them, then others will. And who cares what we produce? More God abiding representatives of this group rationalize their actions by saying that the nuclear powers are just scaring each other, that no one would ever start a nuclear war, and that, moreover, it's having such all-destroying weapons that keeps the other side in check. The logic of deterrence is still popular, although more and more people are coming to understand that the stockpiling of arms is tending to only intensify mistrust and the danger of an accidental nuclear exchange. This is not to mention the blatant immorality of wasting trillions for the arms race at a time when millions of people in the world are dying of hunger.

There is, lastly, a third type of mentality among those promoting another spiral of the arms race. It is characterized by the old sort of pathological anti communism and a desire to eliminate the Soviet Union from the world scene either physically or, by trying to wear it out, economically, through the arms race. The failure of such attempts in the past hasn't yet seemed to weaken this group's hope for success in the future, when they'll be throwing away money expressed by digits with twelve zeros. It's these circles that are

masterminding the campaign against the Geneva agreements, notably against the principle of not seeking strategic superiority. And it's these same circles that insist on the continuation of the Star Wars programme.

Many analysts, and not in the Soviet Union alone, are alarmed not just because the military-industrial complex's influence is growing, against which Dwight D. Eisenhower warned in his day, but more so because this influence is becoming uncontrollable. The 12 biggest companies of the military industrial complex are beginning to shape the policy of the USA and throw up ever new obstructions before the path leading to an ending of the arms race and a beginning of civilized world relations.

The impact of these "military monies" can also be seen in the continuing militarization of thinking at different levels – public opinion, the views of influential circles, including business, and representatives of the political elite, including government leaders. To break this vicious circle, to stop the press towards "nuclear winter", there is a need for people at all political levels to realize the fact that we are at a turning point in human history, beyond which the unpredictability of the international situation and the danger of war will reach a qualitatively new level. The understanding of this must develop into an integral system of a new way of thinking about international coexistence. Many speak about the need for a new way of thinking in the present critical period of human history but, not infrequently, they understand this differently. Let's try and list some features of this new mentality.

The art of good-neighbourliness

The need to reconsider old dogmas of international relations was prompted by the threat of the destruction of world civilization in a nuclear war. The continuing stockpiling of nuclear arms, and their refinement, are making this danger increasingly more acute, while the new notions about "nuclear winter" reaffirm the global nature of the threat. The new common objective of humankind – that of avoiding universal destruction – must bring the Earth's population together to a considerably greater extent than it is disunited by ideological, national, religious or other differences that used to prod people towards international conflicts. Moreover, a universal charac-

ter must also be imparted to the understanding that both nuclear wars and wars fought with conventional weapons, and the use of force for resolving international conflicts, must be excluded from the life of humankind.

Much to our regret, this appallingly simple fact – the possibility of the threat of world civilization being destroyed, of which Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr wrote decades ago – has not yet become understood by all, or is not equally comprehended in full measure by rank and file citizens and political leaders. Here the mechanism of psychological protection comes into operation: many try simply not to think about the horrifying perspective, others gradually grow accustomed to the feeling of constant danger – like people living on slope of a sleeping volcano – it becomes dim and abstract. Still others, at last, are gripped with the pessimism of doomsday, seeing no real way out of the existing impasse. Moreover, some people claim that we are not scared enough for a sharp change to take place in mentality, and that the situation must inevitably deteriorate further and new crises must break out before any turn for the better will occur. Obviously, an understanding of the existing danger and "constructive fear", alone, are not enough to bring about a quick change in the psychology of international relations.

To develop a new mentality and, accordingly, new relationships among states, it is no less important to understand that all of us belong to the same human race, to understand the indivisibility of all life on the planet. The realization of this must proceed not only from a feeling of fear of global nuclear missiles, which have eliminated global distances. It quickly grips cosmonauts when they see our planet from space, and it must come to other people in conditions of a new stage of the scientific and technological revolution and the growing importance of global problems. The "diminution" the "shrinking" of the planet in these conditions, and its greater ecological vulnerability must be conducive in promoting an understanding of this new unity. The mass contacts of people and the development of electronic means of communication must have their part to play in this respect.

It must be said that so far this has gone without a precedent. Even on the level of one nation the feeling of unity arose, as a rule, only in conditions of an external threat or an attack by a hostile country. The inhabitants of the Earth, fortunately, have not yet had such a real external enemy. Will an invisible enemy – the

threat of universal nuclear war – have such a mobilizing role to play?

International morality in the nuclear age

As far as individual countries and peoples are concerned it becomes obvious that, given the realities, there is a need to give up the artificial creation of external "enemies" or fabricated culprits of one's own internal problems, whom it is so easy to blame for all the troubles. Whereas many people see the principle "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image" as customary and habitual, today it will be no less correct to say also – "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven enemy". In present-day conditions this is an unpardonable luxury.

It becomes vital to work out the habits of taking the interests of the other side, the other partners in coexistence into account. First and foremost, this amounts to an understanding of the inadmissibility today of a "zero-sum game", when the gain of one side inevitably entails a loss by the other – all of us will be either winners or losers depending on how the problems of war and peace, of life itself on the planet, will be decided.

More, what is in question is the need to profoundly understand the equality of all nations and peoples, the new morality of rejecting narrow-national egotism and understanding the special and inalienable interests of other countries and peoples. There is a need also to elaborate an inherent desire to see in the other neighbours on the planet their best sides, to appraise the national identity of other peoples, and not to hunt out their drawbacks which are then sized up from positions of one's own superiority. It is time to measure up other countries and peoples not only from a purely economic point of view. There is a need to see that the world is what it is precisely because of each nation's inimitable contribution to world culture. The new mentality must be based not on the unification of the world according to the canons of Western or European civilization, even if with its high level of consumption, but on a desire to keep

intact the inimitable national culture and identity of all nations, and not to allow them to get lost in the mainstream of commercial mass culture.

Similar problems used to arise on the national level as well. Quite often, in this case, the purely racial, religious and other differences and prejudices were not eliminated by the legislative introduction of equality and, more often than not, it has taken centuries to mitigate hostility and mistrust (e.g., between Catholics and Protestants). Alas, the laws of morality and justice have by far not become universal in relations between states. Moreover, whereas morality in relations between people, including religious morality, is fostered in the course of millennia, now only years are allotted to assert the new international morality.

Is this possible!

So far, it has to be admitted, the vicious thinking, which is unfit for the nuclear age, permeates many spheres of politics and military development in the West. The post-war decades alone witnessed the emergence of concepts such as deterrence, balancing on the brink of war, mutually assured destruction, stage by stage and presumably controllable escalation of nuclear confrontation and conflict. All these concepts, each of which is impossible to check except in the process of mutual destruction, take the form of scientific doctrines and have become part of the mass mentality. As Morton Halperin, an American expert in military affairs, once said about this way of thinking: "The NATO doctrine is that we will fight with conventional weapons until we are losing. Then we will fight with tactical nuclear weapons until we are losing. And then we will blow up the world." The customary formulas, brought into the nuclear age from historical periods when bows and arrows dominated the battlefield, continue to seem convincing or inevitable to many.

Is it at all possible to break conservative thinking, to mould a new psychology of international life and to begin building new interrela-

tionships?

Many things that have occurred in recent years suggest a positive answer to this question. First, the mass movements for ending nuclear tests, freezing the nuclear arsenals of the USSR and the USA, discontinuing the deployment of new missiles in Europe, establishing nuclear free zones, for the twinning of cities, broad exchanges of people between East and West, etc., have shown that the understanding of the acuteness of the problem and the urge for detente have gripped millions of people. The results of public opinion polls attest to the same effect.

Many representatives of influential circles, for instance, those American businessmen who, last December, took part in the meeting of the US-USSR Trade and Economic Council, have also spoken out in favour of cooperation and the promotion of good neighbour relations. Scientists, physicians, women's and youth organizations have stepped up their activities for peace, disarmament and civilized relations between the two social systems.

It would be good to believe that the strengthening of the mass movements and the spread of the new ideas among broad sections of the population in different parts of the world will bring about a situation when a new responsible thinking will become universal and bring the armaments machine to a halt. And one can only hope that this process will be accelerated with the help of more vigorous involvement of political leaders, the leaders of states. They can and must exert active influence on mass psychology in these questions and assist in bringing about radical and swift changes in mass thinking. In present-day conditions special responsibility also falls on the mass media, without the interested involvement of which it is impossible, for example, to propagate the "Geneva spirit" and a new mentality in the nuclear age.

And, of course, it is exceptionally important that public opinion should reach its crescendo and become a truly influential force in questions of war and peace.

N. P. Popov, *Cand. Sc. (History)*, is a senior research fellow at the Institute of US and Canadian Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences.

11 April 1986

Lev Semeyko Article

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 7, Feb 86 p 5

[Article by Lev Semeyko: "Nuclear Weapons and Security"]

[Text] The forty years of the nuclear age have produced in the West such an entangled knot of contradictory notions about the role of nuclear weapons in the modern world that one blow will not be enough to cut it. However, it's time to do this. The most dangerous thing is that the need to eliminate nuclear weapons is denied by those (to be more exact - by many of those) on whom the solution of the dilemma - survival or destruction - depends in the real sense of the term. It is a fact that after the publication of the Statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachov there was immediate "alarm" in counterstatements made in Washington: what will happen to security without nuclear arms? After all, the forty postwar years of peace (there was no "big war") must be put, we are told, to the credit of nuclear arms, which served to contain aggression. In a nuclear-free world the security of America, as that of the West as a whole, will allegedly be reduced to naught - it is not for nothing that the idea of totally eliminating the nuclear arsenals by 2000 comes from those "sly Russians". Counterarguing of this kind is absurd. But it should not be considered crude. It needs both an analysis and a backlash.

PARADOX OF THE NUCLEAR AGE

From time immemorial it has been considered axiomatic: weapons, if reliable and skillfully put to use, can and must destroy or repulse the enemy, bring victory and, with it, security. But the nuclear age has created a paradox: nuclear weapons - the most lethal weapons in human history - cannot bring victory. Even if they are "superskillfully" used, they will bring about self-destruction. Perhaps, the most paradoxical thing of all is that the stockpiling of mountains of nuclear weapons leads to a reduction of security.

To our deep regret, this paradox has not been acknowledged by everyone in the West. This is the result of the age-long faith in military might, skillfully used by diplomacy for the sake of ensuring one's own security. This is also a result of blind faith in the strength of military

technology since its capabilities have been increased qualitatively in the computer age. Hence the hope or even faith that nuclear weapons in themselves, particularly in combination with antimissile weapons in space, can guarantee not only security, but even survival in nuclear war. Hence also the acceleration of the arms race and, not infrequently, its approval by those ignorant of all the facts but who have one sincere wish - to survive at all costs.

This is a wrong position. There is no technical means of ensuring safety from the threat of nuclear war and survival in it. This is not only the Soviet point of view. A report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security (the Palme Commission), which includes public figures, politicians and statesmen from 17 countries of Europe, America, Asia and Africa, points out that: "No known technology can even potentially ensure the effective and dependable protection of the population against nuclear attack. Paradoxical

cally it's a fact that whatever unilateral measures a state may undertake to buttress its security, it will, as before, remain vulnerable to nuclear attack and the threat to its security will ultimately be preserved."

Only political measures can strengthen security. The key one can and must be cardinal and all-embracing: a readiness to eliminate nuclear weapons and the realization of this. When the technical means of preserving and strengthening security deplete their capabilities and enter into a contradiction with political ones, priority must be given to politics. It is the latter that is called upon, together with the elimination of nuclear weapons, to also eliminate the paradox of the nuclear age, which is still beyond the comprehension of the advocates of might, which is said to be better the greater it is.

The elimination of nuclear weapons must also prevent the rise of another paradox, namely, that "defensive" space arms should fulfill the offensive functions which they are not intended to do — complement nuclear weapon strikes with means of disarming and beheading the enemy.

A MIRACULOUS CAPABILITY? NO!

On the other hand, an answer must be given to the claim which, by the very way it is posed, ascribes to nuclear weapons the "miraculous" capability of preserving peace.

Western advocates of perpetuating nuclear weapons have used a dual approach to try to explain the postwar phenomenon of peace. Some say that the risk of mutual destruction has had its part to play. It has allegedly contained "both (f) sides" from unleashing war. Others stick to a more one-sided point of view: peace, they say, was ensured solely by the constant buildup of the American military might.

"If in 1990 there has been no nuclear exchange between the US and the Soviet Union," writes the American researcher M. Nacht, "some analysts will surely claim that it was only because of adjustments in the US strategic force posture that war was avoided, while others will just as sincerely contend that nuclear war was never in the cards, irrespective of the nature of the US nuclear force

deployments." Be what it may, but nuclear weapons must be "blessed".

What we have here is a wrong point of departure: the USSR is seen as a potential aggressor and the USA — as an exclusively peaceful state. There is a great discrepancy between such claims and the reality. As estimated by the American analysts B. Blachman and S. Kaplan, between early 1946 and late 1975 the USA threatened to use nuclear weapons on 19 occasions. In other words, the USA alone has acted as potential aggressor throughout the postwar period. It built up its nuclear capability primarily to conduct nuclear war — diversified in forms and methods — not to contain it. And if no nuclear war came about, the crucial role in this was played by the truly containing factor — the existence of a powerful nuclear-missile potential by the USSR. Consequently, the USA and the West as a whole realized the enormous risk they would incur by letting loose a conflict. A risk linked to the inexorability of destructive nuclear retribution.

The USSR is compelled to have the same kind of weapons as the USA and some of its allies. To have them as long as NATO has them, and in the amount needed to ensure military-strategic parity.

The dynamics of the nuclear threat in different years are interesting. According to Blachman and Kaplan, out of the 19 occasions when the USA threatened to use the bomb, nine were during the period of the American nuclear monopoly and the period when the USSR had no strategic means of delivering nuclear weapons. Eight of the times were during the relative strategic superiority of the USA, and two times in the period of its termination and the formation of military-strategic parity (1968 and 1973). Over the past decade when there was an equilibrium in terms of both quantity and quality, there have been no threats to use nuclear weapons at all!

The diminishing number of threats is by no means a result of Washington's peaceful nature which is claimed to be well-nigh "fundamental" to it. The reason is obvious: the growing risk of self-destruction. But this must not be a reassuring factor. The danger of a nuclear conflict — deliberate or inadvertent — remains while nuclear weapons remain in the military arsenals of states. They must be eliminated — stage by stage for good.

THE WAY TO ZERO SECURITY

Security – both national and international – will be reduced to nought if the strategic defense initiative (SDI) in the USA brings about the most dangerous symbiosis of nuclear and space strike weapons. It would be the symbol of likely aggression. This, generally speaking, is so obvious that even Reagan had to admit that "if paired with offensive systems /defensive systems/ can be viewed as fostering an aggressive policy". Not only they can, but they must be viewed as such, considering that Washington goes to the length of suggesting that the nuclear-space sword could be hung over the USSR on an even much thinner thread: if the thread breaks off, America's survival will still be assured. American security at the expense of the USSR's security – this course of the US administration leads ultimately to undermining not only its own (national) security, but international security as well. It goes close to the line, beyond which it would be fatal for the whole of mankind.

It is not fortuitous therefore that at the Geneva summit the Soviet leadership proceeded from the assumption that security matters determine not only Soviet-American relations, but the whole situation in the world. The Soviet Union argued that the nuclear means of attack, covered by a space "shield", would become even more dangerous and that the present strategic balance would be turned into strategic chaos. Such a turn of events cannot be permitted.

The US administration has voiced its desire to eliminate the fear of missile attack and to secure the dismantling of nuclear weapons. This is also our desire. But how can it be brought about? We are convinced that the American way "via space" is futile. The militarization of space will not only leave nuclear weapons intact, but lead to further buildup. One should not entertain the hope that, as American space weapons are developed, the USSR will reduce its strategic potential, thereby helping the United States to weaken it. Nor should there be any thought that the USA would act differently if the USSR started to build up a large-scale antimissile potential. Caspar Weinberger has already made a frank statement to this effect. But if a qualitatively new – nuclear-space – contradiction arises between the two powers and the two systems, practically nothing would be left of international security.

There is but one conclusion: there is a need to implement the Soviet proposal offered in Mikhail Gorbachev's Statement for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the next millennium with a simultaneous ban on space arms. This proposal contains nothing that would lower the security of the USA or its allies. It rules out the possibility of one of the sides gaining military superiority, which is consistent with the demands of strengthening and reinforcing strategic stability. On the whole, it accords with the aims of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

REALISM AND SECURITY IN THE LONG TERM

The Washington Post has intimated that it is wrong to pretend that the world could ever be delivered from the threat of nuclear arms. This is a symptomatic pronouncement, which reveals disbelief in the USSR and in nuclear disarmament. It would be more correct, however, to address it to the American President himself. Indeed, both he and his administration are just pretending that nuclear weapons may become "outdated and unnecessary" if the SDI programme is implemented. Official Washington is pinning its long term calculations on it. Jeane Kirkpatrick, former US Ambassador to the UN, remained outspoken: "We cannot negotiate 'chistoye nebo' (clear sky) with the Soviets; we must build more weapons and put them in space."

And yet we want to be optimistic. We do not want to lose the hope that Washington will display realism. There are grounds for this. After all, the leaders of the USSR and the USA were able to reach some useful understandings as a result of the Geneva meeting, assisted by the display of realism on the American side as well. Washington found it possible and advisable to preserve allegiance to the SALT 2 Treaty. But now there is a need in practice to also preserve allegiance to the goals of the talks on nuclear and space arms. There must be a display of the necessary responsibility.

With the advancement of a package of new Soviet initiatives in the field of disarmament and stronger international security, mankind's chances of survival have grown appreciably. The initiatives geared to disarmament, not to the arms race (let's recall the substance of SDI) are specific to the

utmost regarding the measures proposed, the stages of their implementation, and those responsible for this implementation. The point at issue is fundamentally new - in spirit and content - initiatives intended to guarantee mankind's survival not through the threat of its "assured destruction". This approach is based on a truly new mentality which is so indispensable in the nuclear age, which implies renouncing the predominantly military technical solution to security problems.

The next century may become a non nuclear age and, as such, it will have its own problems of security, which will surely be no less acute than the present ones. The general direction in the solution of coming security problems has already been mapped out in the new Soviet proposals: the imposition not later than 1995-1997 of a ban on the development of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles (laser, radio wave, infrasound and genetic weapons, the killing capacities of which may be no less dangerous than those of the existing weapons of mass destruction); the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces (a signal to start this could be provided by a breakthrough at the Vienna talks); and a search jointly with other states for a common comprehensive approach to the formation of a system of safe and durable peace, notably in Asia.

The end of the 20th century must be marked by the keynote of peace and nuclear disarmament.

/12828

CSO: 5200/1311

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM CONTRASTS SECURITY CONCEPTS

LD181227 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 17 Mar 86

[Panel discussion on U.S. and USSR concepts of security hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov, both from the Moscow United States of America and Canada Institute -- on the "Top Priority" program -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] Last week we discussed the Soviet concept of security outlined by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in the political report to the 27th Communist Party Congress in Moscow. The Soviet concept urges a new approach to security, saying it can be achieved only through political solutions, not through military ones, because the might of modern weapons is such that no military defenses, regardless of how powerful and sophisticated they may be deemed by their creators, will bring the desired protection. Also, security has to be mutual, there being no American security without that of the Soviet Union and vice versa, and in terms of international relations security has to be universal. Well, this being the case, my first question goes to you, Dr Bogdanov. In the White House they see no other way to get rid of nuclear weapons other than through building space defenses in the framework of the "star wars" program or, as it is officially known, the SDI. Well, I would like your opinion on this program.

[Bogdanov] Let me call your attention to one point. In our basics of the new universal international security system SDI takes very important place, in very negative sense, because our point of view is very clear and there is no changing that, which is if you have nuclear sword in the space you dictate your will to the rest of the world.

That's very simple, you know, that's why we are objecting to it very much. It's another side of the medal we have been discussing, of the medal of superiority. Do you agree with me, Sergey?

[Plekhanov] Of course, it's a new way of trying to achieve superiority for the United States. It's very clear. I mean, of course, in public statements from President Reagan we have heard the assertion that SDI is supposed to be a peace shield for the world, for the United States in the first place, but if you go and read the statements from the people who are involved in the technical details of the program, statements from the Pentagon officials, from the scientists involved, it becomes clear that what they have in mind is something much more sinister than that. It's simply buttressing the American offensive potential, the nuclear missile potential of the United States with an antimissile shield for the United States which would make it much easier for American defense planners to think in terms of delivering a first strike against the Soviet Union.

[Kuznetsov] Going back to security. We're speaking about security. The Americans, the White House, the people in the White House are also speaking about security and they're talking about it almost every day. So our concept is to phase out nuclear weapons, not to build space weapons, not to spend trillions of rubles or dollars, or whatever. The American concept of security is to build new weapons, space weapons, and at the same time there is work on the MX missiles, on the Trident II missiles; they are building more cruise missiles, they have been testing them all along in Canada and other places. There is great emphasis on new weapons, with the Midgetman and so on and so forth. In other words, we are faced with two radically opposed concepts of security. How do we overcome this contradiction, is there a mechanism, is there a body apart from the Geneva arms control talks to bridge gaps, to make our differences less obvious, less glaring?

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes. I believe that you have just mentioned all the points which are dividing us with the American concept of security, and in connection with that let me say something about our basics. Numbering one is military field, and in this military field how we perceive how it should be. So we have some very important points, that's my answer to your question. Points, the points which take into consideration the worries of the other (?side), (?by the way), it's not unilateral Soviet remedy. No, we take into consideration what the West is worrying about.

For instance, the point number one is our suggestion that we should refuse to go into nuclear war as a means of solving problems between states. Not only nuclear (?issues) but conventional too. It means that dealing with the nuclear arms we suggest to deal with the conventional arms in the way we are dealing with the nuclear arms. So it means that we are also for reducing them, not building up. We don't want dealing with nuclear arms to bring the arms race into the other (?field, conventional). No. We would like to deal together with both.

Number two, and that is very important, you know, ban on deployment of arms in (?the) space, cosmic striking arms, and at the same time moratorium on the test of all nuclear weapons, with the liquidation of them at the later stage. Then, then, the destruction of chemical weapons -- I mean principled ban on all means of massive destruction of people. If you look at that, you know, you will see that it covers the whole range of the ominous, you know, problems we have to face. Then we say that we at the same time we should strictly go into decreasing military potential of all the states under very strict control by all means.

[Kuznetsov] National, international and on site.

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes, and on-site inspection. So you have a very, very efficient combination of control. And then you (?dissolve) all the military [word indistinct] and then you start (?proportionally) decrease your military budget. And no I believe we should come to the political field of our basics, which are very closely connected to the military.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I agree. Dr Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] Well, I'd like to comment on what Dr Bogdanov has just said. He mentioned the decrease of military budgets. Our listeners should not get the impression that we think that it's the last (?on the point). I mean, this thing could be put in the forefront.

[Bogdanov] Oh, yes, of course.

[Plekhanov] We don't mean that it's just a postponement of the (?alliances).

[Bogdanov] No, no, not at all, not at all.

[Plekhanov] Well, let's (?answer) the political area. It is, I think, a very important point which was made in the report by Comrade Gorbachev that this is a world which is undergoing rapid and dynamic changes. And there is a number of (?actors) in the international scene, I mean the governments, the states [words indistinct]. The number of (?actors is decreasing and so) this is a world system in which the politics based on -- the policies based on force will have less and less room. This is a world where one should get what it wants by means of accommodation, negotiations with the other, taking into account the legitimate interests of other states. This is a world, as Mr Gorbachev has emphasized, which is getting too small and too fragile for policies based on force. And therefore, the new international security system which we would like to see built on this planet involves very strict observance of the principle of respect of each nation to choose the ways and forms of its development. No one should impose its own blueprints and its own will on other states.

Another important point is fair political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts. It's very important to pay attention to what's going on in various regions of the world and those regional conflicts which go on in various parts of the world. They are very bad for international security. We are all for finding adequate and fair political solutions not solutions imposed from the outside but solutions which are based on the local interests, (?laws).

[Kuznetsov] Yes, this is important because the Americans -- Washington -- says that to make any progress in arms control we have to solve regional crises first, kind of making it conditional on arms control. I mean, either we solve or there is no progress in arms control. I mean, do you agree with this?

[Plekhanov] Well, in the first place I don't see why work can't be carried out in both areas, proceeding with arms control and proceeding with the solution of regional...

[Kuznetsov interrupting] ...without any conditions.

[Plekhanov] ...conflicts. Yes, without any conditions whatsoever. And in fact I think it could be turned the other way round. Without arms limitations, without measures to do something in the military area, the solution of regional conflicts becomes more difficult because there are far too many arms in the world.

[Kuznetsov] There are certain areas in which we see eye to eye with the United States. For example, the United States Administration agrees and has gone on record as saying that there can be no winner in a nuclear war. We fully agree with the statement but still there are wide differences.

[Plekhanov] There is another point on which theoretically we agree and that is the danger of terrorism. Comrade Gorbachev emphasized that we consider terrorism a very dangerous phenomenon and that measures, international measures, should be taken to combat terrorism because this is very important. But the problem is, that declarations may sound similar, but when you go into the way those declarations are or are not being implemented, that's where you see the difference.

[Kuznetsov] As President Reagan said, if you want peace prepare for war.

[Bogdanov] Yes, and we have another area of basics, you know, like economical, like humanitarian. We have no time to (?deliberate) on that but I also hope that we will have time. But I just would like to emphasize it's a comprehensive problem including economical and humanitarian problems and if you adopt basics you may come to the conclusion that it's a very good base for a dialogue between all the states and first of all members of the Security Council. Why? Because the responsibility for the security lies with the members of the Security Council. Not because that is their privilege, that is their responsibility. Then it is suggested in the report, very rightly, that why not five permanent members of the Security Council may not yet together to discuss all the human, world problems within the frames of that basic. I think it sounds very, very, very convincing and very promising.

[Kuznetsov] My last question to you, Dr Bogdanov. How do you see -- what is your impression of the Soviet concept of security? Do you believe that it can be realized, implemented, given certain differences and at times very wide differences with the United States?

[Bogdanov] You know, basically, unfortunately, I am a pessimist in the field of the present state of the Soviet-American relations but in this particular case I am more optimistic. You know why? Because all those basics are so appealing, so realistic that after all, Pavel, you know, nobody expected that they will be immediately accepted by USA, by the other countries. It's very good food for thinking, you know. It's a process. It may take some years or decade or so, but I believe that common sense -- and the American people is very famous for the common sense, you know that -- the common sense will prevail and the basics in one way or the other will become a universal, you know, form of cooperation and interaction between states. That's my belief.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, Dr Bogdanov, thank you, Dr Plekhanov. This is "Top Priority". I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Please join us a week from now for another edition of "Top Priority" from the North American service of Radio Moscow.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET PAPER CONTRASTS USSR, U.S. ARMS CURB STANCE

PH201004 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Mar 86 First Edition p 1

[Spartak Beglov "International Review": "Position of Reason and Conscience"]

[Excerpt] In the 27th CPSU Congress documents the Soviet approach to the security problem is raised to a new level of realism taking into consideration the requirements of a modern world abounding with dangers and contradictions. By virtue of the dialectical law on the unity and struggle of opposites, the world has become an interconnected and largely integrated system. As for the nuclear danger, it has equated states in one respect, irrespective of the differences between them: In a big war nobody can stand to one side or benefit from other people's misfortune. If we are talking about the USSR and the United States, security can only be reciprocal, whereas for the world as a whole it can only be universal. Lack of security for one means insecurity for all. And this means that not only nuclear war but also preparations for one -- that is, the arms race and an aspiration for military superiority -- cannot objectively provide political benefits for anybody. Thus, safeguarding security is increasingly a political task which can only be carried out by political means.

Has this voice of reason reached the centers of political power in the West?

Last Wednesday the White House again disappointed the public. The U.S. position on the question of nuclear tests, it noted, has not changed, since the United States continues to gamble on nuclear weapons as "an important element of deterrence for the foreseeable future." However the very next day the world turned its gaze toward the capitals of the two powers with new hope. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's reply to the appeal from the leaders of six countries -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania -- who urged Moscow and Washington to refrain from nuclear tests until the projected Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is held, was made public. Although the 8th month of the unilateral Soviet moratorium has passed without a reciprocal step by the other side, the Soviet reaction to the appeal from the "six" was nevertheless constructive: The Soviet Union will not conduct nuclear explosions even after 31 March--until the first nuclear explosion by the United States.

But what about Washington? A new deceptive maneuver was forthcoming, involving a "counterproposal" on the technical form of the procedure for on-site verification [proverka] and a repetition of the invitation to send observers from the USSR to nuclear tests in the United States.

Imperial arrogance and a course aimed at undermining peoples' sovereignty is the only way you can describe the program for direct U.S. interference in the affairs of Nicaragua and other states spelled out in President Reagan's 16 March television address and other statements by him on this subject.

A few days earlier we heard a U.S. Government demand for a reduction in the number of personnel of the permanent representations of the USSR and a number of other UN members at the New York headquarters of this international organization. In other words, yet another attempt has been made to dictate its will to the world community.

So what remains of the statements which the U.S. President made at the November summit concerning his readiness to make a real contribution to the cause of ending the arms race and averting a nuclear war? It is clear to everybody that the fate of the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting depends to a considerable extent on the answer to this question.

When, 4 months after Geneva, the U.S. President starts to tell his compatriots with renewed force that the fate of every stage in negotiations with the USSR is determined by a new addition to U.S. military strength, reality and illusion enter into sharp contradiction with each other. To put it figuratively, a single escalator cannot operate in opposite directions -- up and down -- at the same time.

News has come in from the United States that public debates on the theme "A Strong National Defense and Arms Reduction: Are They Compatible?" were held at Harvard University's J.F. Kennedy School last Friday. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger's speech was again in the vein of "the logic of the absurd": In order to promote the cause of arms reduction... it is necessary to continue to arm(!). Senator Edward Kennedy rejected these assertions, including the fairytale that the USSR returned to the negotiating table only because the United States "has become strong." In practice it was precisely the U.S. Administration that was compelled to agree to this under the pressure of circumstances and public opinion in the United States and other countries. The senator showed on the basis of facts that the USSR has found the requisite response whenever the American side has opted for a new spiral of the arms race. The same will also happen with SDI. This program will lead to futile expenditures of money and resources.

"Even now, of course," M.S. Gorbachev noted in his speech at the final session of the congress, "aggressive forces would prefer to freeze in and perpetuate confrontation. But what are we to do, comrades? Slam the door? It cannot be ruled out that this is precisely what we are being encouraged to do. But we are well aware of our responsibility for the fate of the country and the fate of peace. Therefore we do not intend to pander to those who would like mankind to live with the nuclear threat and the arms race."

The only choice which is acceptable for mankind has in fact been made already by the reason and conscience of all people of good will. It has been powerfully reinforced by the foreign policy strategy proclaimed by the 27th CPSU Congress on behalf of our entire 278 million-strong people. And the future lies with this policy.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

11 April 1986

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR CRITICIZES ALLEGATIONS OF TREATY VIOLATIONS

PM201034 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Mar 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel of the Reserve V. Chernyshev, candidate of technical sciences:
"In a Web of Lies"]

[Text] It has already become an established custom in Washington that, as soon as Congress starts debating the latest military budget, the decrepit scarecrow of the "Soviet military threat" is taken out of storage and dusted off, any tears are urgently patched up, and it is paraded at the head of a new attempt to wring out some cash for yet another round of the arms race.

This method was established way back by the late lamented John Foster Dulles. He was the author of the scenario to be followed when pushing through militarist plans: "In order to force the country to carry the burden linked with maintaining a large military machine," he wrote in the book "War, Peace, and Change," "it is necessary to create an emotional situation equivalent to a war mentality. It is necessary to paint a picture of an external threat.... This demands the development of an ideology of a hero-nation and a villain-nation to the highest possible degree, and also the cultivation of readiness for sacrifice among the population." The incumbent U.S. Administration has, so to speak, "refined" this scenario. Forgeries are now made not only when a new military budget is awaiting approval; the web of lies which, according to the Dulles recipe, is meant to create an "emotional situation" is being spun continuously. Reports, brochures, and "studies" are produced one after the other on the side of the ocean. The U.S. Administration is making considerable efforts to accuse the Soviet Union of allegedly violating the treaties and agreements it has signed.

The question is: Why are these mountains of lies piling up? The goals that are pursued are different: To diminish the significance of Soviet peace initiatives and simultaneously to whitewash the U.S. leadership's plans and deeds which are dangerous for mankind; to shift onto the USSR the blame for its own actions which undermine treaties and agreements; to cover up and even to justify the repudiation of accords which hinder Washington; and to prevent any constructive agreements between the USSR and the United States on curbing the arms race and improving the international situation.

It is typical that the slanderous campaigns in this direction center primarily on those treaty and agreement provisions which hinder most of all the implementation of U.S. military programs. For example, there is talk about some kind of "violations" by the Soviet Union of the ABM Treaty and the SALT II Treaty. Counting on people who are uninformed about the real state of affairs and are unfamiliar with the content of these treaties, official Washington does not even bother about the elementary logic of its own fabrications.

It is claimed, for example, that the USSR is implementing its own ABM program, that it is "ahead of" the United States in this sphere, and that it is possibly even "preparing an ABM system for the country's territory." And that the U.S. "star wars" program is nothing but a "response" to the Soviet work. Yet, when the White House advanced the "star wars" program 3 years ago, it was presented in a completely different fashion, as a new means which would supposedly render nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete." It is not without reason that the Western mass news media immediately described the current "interpretation" as an "insult" to the authors of the U.S. program. The U.S. attempts to convince the world public that the USSR is supposedly conducting work on a "star wars" program, the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN wrote, contradict earlier statements by President Reagan, who presented his SDI plans as "a potential means of deliverance" from the threat of nuclear war.

Nor does the thesis about the Soviet Union being "ahead of" the United States stand up to any close examination. After all, the White House chief repeatedly promised to "share SDI technology" with the USSR. There is obviously something to be "shared." Yet, quite recently, speaking on nationwide television, the President openly declared in connection with U.S. space weapons: "We must translate our advantage at laboratory level into an advantage in specific weapons." All this goes to confirm yet again that it is the United States and not the USSR that is aiming to undermine the ABM Treaty by developing [razrabatyvaya] a large-scale ABM system with space-based components.

The situation is no better as regards the claims by U.S. Administration spokesmen that the USSR is allegedly developing [razrabatyvat] laser weapons. In connection with these fabrications, U.S. specialists recall that in March 1977 J. Carter, who was president at the time, at the clumsy prompting of the Pentagon accused the USSR of attempts to "blind" U.S. early warning satellites by using lasers. The Pentagon was subsequently forced to admit that soldering work on a major pipeline, which was taking place in the USSR, had been mistaken for "attempts to blind."

But the present U.S. Administration has learned nothing from this lesson. At times Washington finds itself in an awkward situation in its desire to "accuse" the Soviet Union. For example, in the latest report on "violations" of international commitments by the Soviet Union which was sent to the U.S. Congress in December 1985, the administration "made a revelation": "Only the USSR has an operational ABM system." And yet the existence of the ABM system deployed around Moscow is strictly in line with the ABM Treaty. Let us recall that systems with similar potential exist also in the United States, which is also in line with the treaty.

The "facts" cited in Washington's reports and studies are clearly meant for those who have never even looked at the text of the Soviet-American treaty. It was not without reason that Senator D. Bumpers, addressing the Senate recently, complained about the administration's so-called "reports" on the observance of agreements. A lack of information which creates confusion in Congress and throughout the country -- this is how he described the U.S. Government "reports." In his speech, the senator cited an example offering vivid evidence of the unscrupulousness of the administration, which is concealing the real state of affairs not only from the public but also from Congress. U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger, presenting the deployment of the SS-25 ICBM (Soviet codename RS-12M) in the USSR as a violation of the SALT II Treaty, "does not tell us that the Russians are dismantling older missiles in order not to exceed the ceilings set by the treaty," D. Bumpers concluded. For our party, let us add that in actual fact this is not a new but a modernized missile and that its specifications are fully in line with the relevant provisions of SALT II.

Incidentally, the White House has gotten into a real mess as a result of its claims about alleged violations of SALT II provisions by the Soviet Union. And at least twice, at that. Let us recall that initially, in late 1985, the U.S. representative on the Permanent Consultative Commission, which was officially set up by the sides for verification [proverka] of the observance of agreements that have been concluded, confirmed in the U.S. Congress that the USSR honors the commitments it has made. Later on, in February 1986, in the report "The Military Position of the United States" which they submitted to Congress, the Joint Chiefs of Staff cited "evaluations by intelligence organs" indicating that the Soviet Union fully honors its commitments. "It would be grave irresponsibility on the part of the administration," THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote in this connection, "to officially accuse the Soviet Union of violating the quantitative ceilings imposed by SALT II."

The originators of all kinds of insinuations in the U.S. leadership are champions of the interests of those circles which obstruct the full application of treaties and agreements previously signed by the United States. Actually, they make no secret of their aspirations. "We must examine the possibility of a real breakdown of the ABM Treaty," Weinberger declared. His assistant Perle also called openly for the SALT II Treaty to be "discarded as unnecessary for America."

This policy is dangerous for the entire world. Today mutual relations between the USSR and the United States will depend largely on whether the positive elements achieved in the seventies will be successfully preserved. The Soviet Union does not pursue military superiority, and it has no incentive to repudiate or violate accords elaborated on the basis of equality and identical security. It is official Washington that continues to seek ways to achieve military superiority over the USSR. A reminder must be issued once more: The Soviet Union is in a position to make an adequate response to any challenge that people want to make. And if we are forced to, the response will be made.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA REPORTS NEWS CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

PM201114 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To Terminate Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on current issues of international relations was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 18 March.

It was noted at the briefing that statements by many statesmen and politicians from various countries testify that the Soviet initiatives set out in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement and in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress meet with the support of the broad international public. Statements by official spokesmen from the United States and its NATO allies are in evident discord with this. As before, leaders of Western powers, and primarily of the United States, are concentrating their efforts on seeking not ways to reach accords but arguments justifying the rejection of accords.

A few days ago the Soviet Union declared its readiness to refrain from nuclear tests even after 31 March -- until the first nuclear test in the United States -- and called for the start of talks on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests.

And yet the U.S. President, in a recent statement, not only continued to insist that nuclear tests must be conducted, but even proposed to legalize them by the presence of Soviet representatives.

It is well known that the Central Committee Political Report to the party congress put forth the concept of an all-embracing system of international security. Confirmation of the need for joint efforts in the quest for ways to solve regional conflicts is an integral part of this concept.

The U.S. leadership reacted quite strangely to the submission of the Soviet concept of security. A few days ago the U.S. President sent to Congress a special message on questions of regional security in which he again attempted to find a moral justification and provide some kind of theoretical basis for the policy of uncerecermonious interference in the affairs of sovereign countries and peoples. Nor did the U.S. President refrain from crude anti-Soviet attacks, camouflaging the policy of state terrorism and "neoglobalism" implemented by Washington.

A request was made for comment on the statement made by Britain's prime minister in Parliament to the effect that the Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles would supposedly mean that "a certain number of missiles will be transferred to the Far East" and that these missiles -- or so it was claimed -- "can of course be redeployed."

This statement makes it evident, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, that people in the West continue to make attempts to distort the essence of Soviet proposals. The January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee says perfectly clearly that we are in favor of the complete elimination of USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone, both ballistic and cruise missiles, as a first step along the path of freeing Europe from nuclear weapons. Attempting to complicate the reaching of agreement, London is artifiically raising questions of the military balance in Asia, whose practical solution is envisaged by the Soviet program at the appropriate stage. Thus, matters are being held up not by the Soviet stance but by the lack of political will on the part of the leaders of a number of Western countries to take the path of nuclear disarmament.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZAMYATIN VIEWS RESULTS OF REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 1, Jan 86 pp 3, 5

[Article by Leonid Zamyatin]

[Text] The meeting between Mikhail Gorbachov, General Secretary of the CPSU General Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the USA, in Geneva, the first Soviet-US summit in more than six years, was, of course, the biggest political event in the international life of 1985.

What was the need for the summit and what goals did the USSR pursue when it went to it?

THE PRESERVATION OF CIVILIZATION AND LIFE ITSELF IS AT STAKE

The international relations of today are at a special, crucial stage of development when humanity is confronted with a choice between survival or nuclear annihilation. The degree of unpredictability of events is growing as a result of the continuing arms race. The possibility of the militarization of outer space signifies a qualitatively new stage in the arms race, which would inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability, the basis of a preservation of peace in the nuclear age. The world has arrived at a place where especially responsible decisions are necessary, when inaction or a delay in activities are criminal, because the preservation of civilization and life itself is at stake.

In these conditions the Soviet leadership deems it necessary to do everything possible to stop the vicious spiral of the arms race, to alter the turn of events for the better and not to let the forces of militarism and aggression get the upper hand. The April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee has posed for itself the task of an all-round

broadening of the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy, as much as possible, in terms of international relations. It can be said that we have decided to concentrate our attention on a constructive direction, on the search for the road to a better, more peaceful world. When implementing this idea, our country builds its foreign policy on a ramified basis, striving to interact with the broadest possible range of countries in the interests of peace. Only the efforts of all countries - both big and small - can help the world extricate itself from the morass of dangerous tensions.

Neither can we ignore the fact that there are countries in today's world which - due to their military, economic, scientific and technical capability and international weight - bear a special responsibility for the nature, course and consequences of world-wide development. The USSR and the USA bear this responsibility more than anyone else. The UN Charter also imposes on them this responsibility. The two countries' special responsibility and the complexity of the international situation convinced us on the eve of Geneva that a direct talk with the US president was necessary.

Our country went, of course, to Geneva, without harbouring any illusions in relation to the present US administration's policy, because it realized very well how great the militarization of the economy and the political thought has become in that country. However, we know, as we did before, also that Washington's militarist policy had to inevitably (as it is already doing) clash with reality. The Soviet line which firmly opposes the USA's attempts to torpedo the military and strategic balance, combined with our large-scale peace initiatives and restrained and constructive approach to the local questions of peace and security, has been agreed upon with the fraternal socialist countries, and is approved and supported by the world public and the governments of many countries. This line is forcing Washington to procrastinate and invent all sorts

of excuses that sound like various peace proposals. The atmosphere of Soviet-US relations and, to some extent, the international behaviour of the USA, started to change under the influence of these factors, and we could not but take this into account when considering the question of a possible summit meeting.

However, the main thing is that the Soviet leadership decided in favour of the summit because, as always, it does not think that it has the right to ignore even the slightest chance to change the dangerous developments in the world, realizing that if a direct and frank dialogue is not started now, then tomorrow it will be even much harder and maybe even too late.

We took into account the opinions of our friends and allies, the positions of governments and the public in many countries and their persistent

appeals to the USSR to do everything possible that the summit would be held. Realizing how many hopes all over the world were being pinned on this meeting, the Soviet leadership clearly realized also that the nations in all the countries are in favour of peace and aspire not only to preserve peace, but also to improve the situation and achieve real changes in the struggle to end the arms race. The Soviet leadership proceeded firmly from the premise that the talks should be centred around the questions which determine Soviet-US relations and the entire situation in the world - the questions of security. We went to the Geneva summit and prepared for it, deeming it necessary to try and change - by force of arguments by force of example and by force of common sense - the dangerous developments

Direct and Clear Conversation

Even before the meeting the USSR did everything possible to lay the foundations of mutual understanding and to improve the political atmosphere. The USSR clearly showed, by its disarmament initiatives, what it is working for in the world arena and what it proposes to the USA and its allies. The question of war and peace, of arms limitations became the main question, the mainstay of the Geneva talks. The Americans failed to reduce the talks to a discussion of second-hand matters.

The talks were sharp and extremely frank. The USSR's assessment of the world situation was explained to the US president. It was stressed that the objective course of the world process has put the questions of war, peace and survival in the centre of world politics. It was also stressed that the acuity of the moment did not leave the leaders of the USSR and the USA, the nations of the USSR and the USA any other alternative but to learn the great science of living together. The question is obvious - we must renounce our narrow interests and realize our common responsibility in the face of the danger which is

looming over humanity on the threshold of the third millennium.

In spite of all the differences in the approaches and assessments, both the USSR and the USA have one common thing that could serve as a point of departure on the way to improving Soviet-US relations - it is the realization that nuclear war can't be allowed to happen, that it mustn't be waged and that there won't be any winners. It follows from this that the problem of security is the central problem in the relations between our two countries at the present stage.

It was declared once again in Geneva that the USSR is not aspiring for nor will it work to achieve military superiority over the USA. At the same time we will never allow the USA to achieve military superiority over us. Mikhail Gorbachev said, outright, that it was high time both countries got used to strategic parity as a more natural state in Soviet-US relations. We must work to lower the level of this parity by common effort, i.e. to implement realistic measures for a mutual reduction of nuclear arms.

The SDI Barrier

Another fundamental conclusion which is very topical also now, after Geneva – neither the USA nor the USSR must do anything that would let the arms race penetrate new areas, specifically outer space. In the course of the talks with the US president our attitude to his Strategic Defense Initiative was explained and profound arguments were given, which should help the US leadership to realize all the ruinous nature of the 'star wars' programme. The SDI is the main obstacle in the way to a radical reduction of nuclear arms.

As is well known, the USSR had made practical proposals, earlier, at the Soviet-US talks on nuclear and space weapons, being held in Geneva, saying that we are prepared for a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, if the arms race in space is firmly avoided. Granted this condition, the USSR is prepared to carry on the first stage on the basis of a 50 per cent cut

in nuclear weapons, and, later on, drawing the other nuclear powers into the process, to continue radical reductions and complete eradication of nuclear weapons.

What can be said about this now? If the USA will find the will and the resolution to reconsider anew all the ruinous consequences of the 'star wars' programme, then the road will be open for a constructive solution of the problems of international security and ending the arms race. The consistent strengthening of mutual confidence and a general improvement of the political atmosphere would become possible on this basis.

The differences between the USSR and the USA will, of course, remain. But it must be made so that they would not go beyond permissible bounds and lead to a military confrontation. Let each of the social systems prove its advantages by force of example. The USSR is all for that.

Regional Problems

The president was told in Geneva that much in the development of the USSR-USA relations depends on how clearly each of the sides realizes today's world realities and takes them into account when shaping its policy. The world of today is a very motley entity of sovereign countries and nations who have their own interests, their own aspirations, policy, traditions and dreams. Each nation has a natural desire to exercise its sovereign rights in the political, economic and social fields. These rights should be respected.

The world is not anybody's domain and we reject such an approach.

In principle, we are not against discussing with the USA these or other regional problems with the aim of seeking ways towards settling them. Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan agreed to exert joint efforts in

this direction. But we never tire of stressing that all that must be done without interference in the internal affairs of other states. This is the essence of our line.

Such is, in brief, the concept of Soviet-US relations which had been explained to the US president. The Soviet leadership, and this was stressed in the talks with the US president, has the political will to work on this basis on solving the accumulated problems and on removing the obstacles that have formed in the Soviet-US relations. But this work must be done by joint efforts. Mikhail Gorbachev told Ronald Reagan that it would be a grave error not to capitalize on the chance that has appeared to start normalizing Soviet-US relations, which would mean an improvement of the world situation on the whole.

Are the Americans Prepared To Make Major Decisions for Peace?

The trek to the Geneva dialogue was both long and hard. It is enough to recall the sizzling anti-Soviet rhetoric and the "power" activities of the present administration when it took office in the early 80s. But even lately, mighty political forces have continued, as before, to do everything so as, if not to torpedo the meeting altogether, then at least to reduce its significance and emaciate its contents.

Geneva has shown that the US side is as yet not prepared to make any major decisions. The reluctance of the US leadership to renounce its "star wars" programme made it impossible to reach in Geneva practical accords on real disarmament and, above all, on the central problem of nuclear and space weapons. In the post-Geneva period the US military-industrial complex is going all out to step up the implementation of the "star wars" programme. The USA's negative

stand concerning the moratorium on nuclear blasts and their continuation of nuclear weapons tests shows that the forces which are against a reaching of accords on arms questions, including such an urgent question as ending nuclear tests, are still strong within the US administration. The USA should really pay heed to the demands of the world community and join the USSR in announcing a moratorium on nuclear blasts. The fact that this hasn't yet been done shows that there are no positive shifts to date in the USA towards curbing the nuclear arms race. And the matter of verification has nothing to do with this. If the USA agrees to reciprocate, the USSR has offered to agree with it on some measures of on-the-spot verification so as to remove all possible doubts on the fulfilment of the moratorium. This is a truly practical road towards a mutually acceptable settlement of the world's most important problem - disarmament.

ment

The arms race is continuing because of the stand taken by the USA and this cannot but cause anxiety among all nations. The US administration is still lured by the idea of achieving military superiority. When starting the arms race in space they want to outdo us in electronics and computers. In this context we said quite definitely in Geneva that the USSR will find a reply to the deployment of space strike weapons. And it will be an effective, adequately quick and less costly programme than the USA's. But we will resort to this only if the USA leaves us no other choice. Our choice is "star peace" and not "star wars", we are against the militarization of space.

The USSR and the USA are still divided by major contradictions on a number of other fundamental questions of the world situation and of world developments in separate regions of the globe.

Where Accord Was Reached

However, we are far from belittling the importance of the accords reached in Geneva, or the meeting's favourable results. The meeting was useful and necessary. Its results create opportunities to go on from the state of dangerous confrontation to a constructive search for the normalization of Soviet-US relations and for improving the world situation as a whole.

The direct, clear cut and concrete conversation and the opportunity to compare the positions was useful. Too many explosive and grave problems have accumulated, which had to be considered, and an attempt had to be made to start dealing with them.

The personal contact established between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the US president was valuable. The dialogue between the highest leaders in our complex times is a stabilizing factor in itself.

Of fundamental importance was the understanding fixed in the joint statement that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there will be no winners, and the obligation of the USSR and the USA to conduct their relations based on this knowledge, and not to aspire for military

superiority. Of course, the joint statement is not a treaty, but it is a fundamental, very much binding statement of the leaders of both states, which has a logic of its own - since it is recognized that a nuclear war cannot serve the achievements of any rational goals, then the stronger must be the stimulus for averting it, for ending R and D work on and testing of the means of mass annihilation, and for the complete liquidation of the stockpiles of nuclear arms. Even more so, the opening up of new directions in the arms race must be avoided.

The two sides agreed to step up the fulfilment of the tasks posed in the joint Soviet-US statement of January 1985, i.e., to avert the arms race in space and end it on Earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and to strengthen strategic stability. The US stand and its conformity to this agreement must be expressed in practical proposals at the forthcoming talks in Geneva in early January.

Further on, the USSR and the USA have clearly confirmed their obligation to promote the all round raising of the effectiveness of the non-proliferation of nuclear arms accords, and jointly spoke in favour of a universal and complete banning and

destroying of chemical weapons. The accord on the promotion of the soonest possible successful completion of the Stockholm conference also goes far beyond the context of Soviet-US relations.

The meeting resulted in the appearance of a number of useful agreements in many fields of bilateral USSR-USA cooperation - on exchanges in science, education and culture and on the resumption of the air flights between our two countries. These agreements can serve as a good basis for raising the confidence between our two nations, if, naturally, we shall treat carefully all that we have achieved and develop everything good that it contains, and not seek artificial pretexts to destroy it. Cooperation must be conducted on an equal footing without any sort of discrimination or preconditions and without attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the other side. This stand of the USSR is firm and consistent.

We must make special mention of the significance of the accord reached in Geneva on the continuation of the political contacts between the USSR and the USA, including those on a summit level.

What Will the Events Lead to?

People everywhere are now wondering – where will the events in Soviet-US relations and in the world as a whole lead to after Geneva? One of the political results of the Soviet-US summit is that it has stepped up the interest of the world public in the most important international problems. We in the USSR are glad of this mounting interest. It is an additional factor in achieving the development of events towards which all the globe's peace forces aspire.

We can also observe another process – the results of the Geneva summit have increased the activities in the West of the opponents of a normalization – the "super-hawks" – the adherents to the preservation and even toughening of the US administration's course in relation to the USSR and the socialist community as a whole. We, of course, see this and take it into account.

Now we have to concentrate on settling the most important questions that were not solved in Geneva. Above all, it is necessary that the sides

should refrain from actions which would impede the achievement of future accords or erode the existing limitations on the arms race. This presupposes, in particular, an honest and precise abidement by the ABM Treaty and also the further abidement by both sides by the relevant provisions in the SALT 2 Treaty. And the main thing is to work for a real ending of the arms race and to begin to take practical steps on reducing the existing nuclear stockpiles.

The opportunity for that is here. We may assume that some points of contact have become apparent in the positions of the USSR and the USA in the cardinal question. True, at present our and US proposals on the reduction of nuclear arms differ in many respects. The US proposals are half-and-half in nature and are permeated to date by the aspiration to achieve military superiority for the USA and for NATO as a whole. Nevertheless, we are of the opinion that solutions are possible and we are prepared to search for them. Naturally, if events develop in this

direction, the questions of reliable verification would also be solved. But it is absolutely imperative to block the way for weapons to outer space. Radical reductions of nuclear weapons are impossible without this.

We have a realistic chance today to abate dramatically the threat of a nuclear war and then to remove its possibility completely. It would be a fatal error not to capitalize on this chance. We must hope that the things the US side said about the SDI in Geneva (and it advertised the SDI in all possible ways) is not the Americans' last word on it. At the same time, it is clear that the very fact of the continuing talks must not serve as a justification and a screen for the arms race.

On the whole the USSR is proposing an all embracing package of measures which block all the directions of the arms race. The practical proposals on this, which we had made earlier in Vienna, Geneva and Stockholm, retain their force and are completely up to date.

A Necessary Possibility

As Mikhail Gorbachov said, we have entered an exceptionally responsible period, when words, intentions and political statements must be translated into practical decisions and deeds.

The Soviet side treats in earnest the accords reached in Geneva and will strive towards improving not only the general atmosphere but also the content of Soviet-US relations on the basis of mutual respect and complete equality without any kind of discrimination. The USSR is prepared to work, in a spirit of honest interaction with the USA, to curb the arms race, to avert its spread to outer space, to improve the world situation. And we have a right to expect a similar approach by the USA.

The same as the activities of the

Soviet delegation at the Geneva summit, our line after Geneva is also an embodiment of the Leninist peace-loving foreign policy course of the USSR, the course on strengthening confidence among nations, on the development of constructive cooperation, and is a testimony of the USSR's constant search for the solution of even the most complex problems by political means, by negotiation. We are convinced that cooperation of people, nations, states with different social systems and ideologies is, as Mikhail Gorbachov said, quite possible and, today, also quite necessary.

In conducting this policy of principle, and in the struggle for a durable peace and cooperation between nations, the USSR will continue to interact closely with its Warsaw Treaty allies and all countries of socialist community.

/9317

CSO: 5200/1308

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S LOMEYKO'S 20 MARCH PRESS BRIEFING REPORTED

LD201620 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 20 TASS -- Soviet and foreign correspondents have been told at a briefing of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR here today that the participants in a regular meeting of the committee of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member countries in Warsaw on March 19-20 fully supported the complex of major foreign policy actions of the USSR, outlined by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement on January 15, 1986, and urged the NATO countries, primarily the USA, Britain and France, to show full responsibility in approaching the proposal on nuclear disarmament.

Addressing the journalists, Vladimir Lomeyko, chief of the Press Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, said that the foreign ministers had expressed the hope that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit would concentrate on questions involved in reaching concrete agreement on cuts in nuclear armaments. The United States, naturally, should undertake not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries and Britain and France not to build up their appropriate nuclear armaments.

The participants in the meeting especially emphasized that the common interests of the European countries call for rejecting any programs and ideas for spreading the arms race to outer space. They pointed to the dangerous nature of plans for the so-called European Defense Initiative and other projects threatening to accelerate the arms race in the European Continent. Stress was made at the Warsaw meeting, the spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said, on the urgency of the issue of stopping nuclear testing as a top-priority practical measure that will appreciably improve the atmosphere ahead of the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Attention was also called to the need for effective, including international, verification in all fields of arms limitation, arms reduction and disarmament, verification that should correspond to the scope and nature of the obligations assumed by the sides.

When answering questions from journalists, the head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Press Department, said that the Federal Republic of Germany's involvement in the U.S. "star wars" program shows that the West German military-industrial complex wants a part in the arms race which it intends to extend to outer space. Any form of participation in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, he said, is dangerous for West Germany itself as well as for other European nations and ultimately for the world in general.

Dwelling on the statement of the U.S. Department of Defense with the help of which it tried to justify the violation of the state frontier of the U.S.S.R. by U.S. naval ships with references to the right of peaceful passage through the territorial waters of a country, Lomeyko emphasized that this provocative action had nothing in common with peaceful passage. It was nothing less than a wide-scale espionage operation against the U.S.S.R. which pursued the aim of collecting intelligence data about the Soviet Armed Forces. An official spokesman for the Washington administration told journalists in the Pentagon in this connection that the decision about the violation of the Soviet state frontier by the U.S. naval ships was a political decision taken at a markedly higher level than the commanders of those two ships. In other words, Lomeyko said, Washington's reaction confirms that the case in point was a pre-planned defiant provocation against the Soviet Union.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SHEVARDNADZE ON U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS DURING POLAND TRIP

LD202117 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1900 GMT 20 Mar 86

[Interview with Foreign Affairs Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by correspondent Jerzy Wajszczuk on 20 March in Warsaw; questions and answers in Russian with superimposed Polish translation--recorded]

[Excerpt] [Wajszczuk] Of particular importance to the contemporary world are Soviet-American relations. What can you say about the dialectic and specific character of these relations in current conditions?

[Shevardnadze] First of all, I would like to say that Comrade Gorbachev stressed that we do not look at the contemporary world exclusively through Soviet-American relations. Every state, every nation has its own place under the sun and our stance takes into consideration the policy of each state and takes into consideration the differing characteristics of such states -- regions and continents. Soviet-American relations do, however, define to a significant degree and in some spheres decisively, the general climate of international relations. Unfortunately, recent years -- since the beginning of the eighties -- have not produced anything good for us. The U.S. Administration was to blame for the increasingly aggravated situation. And as everyone knows the Geneva meeting took place and it brought about specific results. But I would not say that a radical improvement of the international atmosphere has occurred. However, certain results were achieved. The concept of a Geneva spirit was formed, and this has some significance.

[Wajszczuk] How do current Soviet-American relations appear?

[Shevardnadze] In Geneva Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan agreed to a follow-up meeting, to a further stage of talks. We are taking preparations for this meeting very seriously, and all our notions and our concepts of this meeting were presented by Mikhail Gorbachev in his declaration of 15 January 1986. It contains our proposals for the liquidation of nuclear arms, for the solution of this problem in stages to the end of the current century. It also contains our proposals for the liquidation of all types of weapons of mass destruction. We also proposed, as we see it, a universal system of control and other imperative measures for the fulfillment of this programme.

[Wajszczuk] And one more question about international relations. Of particular importance to Europe is European security. What do you think about this?

[Shevardnadze] We all agree with this and I will also say that this is an important element, an important factor of world security in general--precisely the case of Europe, of European security. The West also agrees with this verbally but when it comes to concrete actions, it turns out that our partners in the West are still not ready.

Here I have concrete examples in mind. Recently we proposed the abolition of Soviet medium-range missiles--the so called SS-20's--and also the abolition of U.S. missiles deployed in Europe, such as Pershing, cruise, and also tactical missiles. When we raise the subject during direct negotiations, for example during talks in Geneva, it appears that our interlocutors are not prepared for that. As a matter of fact, to put it bluntly, they do not want to part with U.S. missiles.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S Ilichev interviewed on Gorbachev arms proposal

LD222111 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Leonid Ilichev, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, was interviewed today by the correspondents of Czechoslovak radio and television. Stefan Babiak, our permanent correspondent in USSR, reports:

We spoke with Leonid Ilichev in particular about the significance of the Soviet proposals contained in the declaration by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. When asked how Moscow assesses the stands of Western governments to these proposals, Leonid Ilichev said:

[Begin recording in Russian fading to Czech translation] I think the wide international reaction to our proposals is a result of the principally new, far reaching realistic basis of the Soviet initiatives that show the way to the total eradication of mass destruction weapons and averting a nuclear catastrophe. The fate of mankind and the solution of its global problems depends on it. As for the stand of the Western governments, I would like to emphasize that this time they have not immediately rejected our initiatives as in the past. They are still studying our proposals and mutually consult their stands on them. We understand that it is necessary to study them carefully if they are to take a serious attitude to them. However, this process cannot be prolonged indefinitely. Time does not stand still. The mountain of weapons grows daily and international security diminishes accordingly. Therefore, the nations justifiably expect practical steps from the Western governments toward halting the arms race and improving the situation in the world.

In particular, I would like to emphasize the issue of nuclear tests. The USSR has prolonged its moratorium on nuclear explosions until the end of March and, in this way, has given the United States extra time to think things over. It must be stressed however that we cannot display unilateral restraint.

The West used to complain about the problems of verification. Now we confirm in all seriousness that verification can be ensured at the necessary international level, including on-site inspection. What is necessary today in particular is the political will of the West to approach this step. [end recording]

When asked how small and medium size countries can participate in implementing the proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Leonid Ilichev said the plan for abolishing nuclear and chemical weapons and improving the international atmosphere is in harmony with the interests of all states of the world. There is no other sensible alternative way of development. We are realists and we

know that the new Soviet proposals require much effort to be implemented. What is above all necessary is to overcome the old way of thinking and substitute it with a new one that suits the needs of the nuclear era. It must not be based on stockpiling new weapons systems but on extending the cooperation of states, big and small, cutting military budgets, and using the saved funds for tackling ecological and other global problems.

We understand the term reliable security as security for all states, Ilichev said. Therefore our new initiatives are addressed to all, to big and small, socialist and capitalist countries. It is very important today that the small and medium-sized states realize how serious the current situation is and that they fully understand that a nuclear or chemical war will spare no one. On the other hand, preventing the threat of war, detente, expanding commercial, scientific-technical and cultural contacts is to the benefit of all states, including the small and medium sized ones because it increases their importance and authority. The USSR does not propose armament instead of progress, but disarmament in the interest of progress. That is our principle, and the small and medium size countries can play a considerable role in its reinforcement.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1304

USSR'S VELIKOV INTERVIEWED ON GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

Brussels LE SOIR in French 24 Jan 86 p 3

[Report on interview with Yevgeniy Velikov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, by correspondent Francis Unwin: "Questions for Velikov, Gorbachev's adviser"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] Will the 16 INF euromissiles set up at Florennes cross the Atlantic again one day? We have not reached that point yet, but the Gorbachev plan has aroused some hopes. Especially since President Reagan, according to The Washington Post, will make a counterproposal next week aiming at reducing the number of Soviet and American INF in Europe. And Tindemanns himself, according to statements reported Thursday by DE MORGEN, is beginning to sense the way the wind is blowing.

It is a coincidence (his visit to Brussels had been postponed because of the Belgian elections), but the presence among us of (Yerny) Velikov, 50 years old, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, a laser specialist and scientific consultant to Gorbachev, who accompanied him to Paris and Geneva, made a rather good impression. Yesterday morning he was the guest of the Chamber's Foreign Affairs Committee, which also intends to receive General Abrahamsom, "director" of the SDI.

Velikov was very logically subjected to a usual bombardment: eleven questions for Karel van Miert alone, who appeared (but was he satisfied?) especially anxious to understand Gorbachev's plan somewhat more clearly. At 1600 hours, at the Soviet Embassy, buried under snow squalls almost like Moscow, there was a new press barrage at the end of which the correspondent of SOIR was allowed to call his own shots in a private interview.

We will see that Velikov is a very artful dodger, no doubt even better than a diplomat, because he is above all a scientist and it is in this capacity that he moves among Gorbachev's close advisers. Moreover, he has a sense of humor. He declared in November to NEWSWEEK that there are two types of specialists in his field: "those who know everything about nothing and those who do not know anything at all. I combine these two talents."

[Question] Mr Velikov, the Gorbachev plan has aroused special hopes among the Europeans, because it could lead to the elimination of all the euromissiles in the west as well as in the east of our continent. Only we do not see clearly to what extent it is connected with the abandonment or the continuation of research on SDI, Mr Reagan's "space shield" project.

[Answer] I do not know all the factors which are involved now. The entire disarmament process is closely connected with SDI.

[Question] Yes, but in Paris, Gorbachev apparently conceded that the laboratory research conducted by the Americans was acceptable. The text of his plan is less clear on that.

[Answer] I do not want to speculate on that. It is already a question which depends on the negotiations in progress in Geneva.

[Question] The Americans make a distinction between several stages of research: basic, exploratory development, advanced development, etc. You do not have anything against basic research?

[Answer] No, but the objective cannot be to destroy the ABM Treaty which limits the response to intercontinental ballistic missile attacks.

[Question] Reagan's SDI or Gorbachev's plan finally have the same ultimate objective; eliminating all nuclear weapons.

[Answer] At first glance, that would seem to be the same thing. But the Gorbachev plan is direct, sure and safe. Mutual security is assured and even reinforced at each stage. Gorbachev said so in Geneva: it is not in our interest for the Americans to feel less secure than we. Whereas the SDI would make the world situation more dangerous at every stage.

[Question] If, as the Soviets say, the SDI would never be an absolute shield, why do they give the impression of believing it so much?

[Answer] It would blow the ABM Treaty to pieces. It would give the Americans a partial defense against missiles, while giving them the time to strengthen their nuclear attack system. But the Gorbachev plan will not be rejected, at the most, delayed for a while.

[Question] And if it was rejected?

[Answer] We would develop effective countermeasures against the SDI, which would be much less expensive than the SDI itself.

[Question] Is it Ronald Reagan's turn to talk?

[Answer] Yes, you should interview him.

8490

CSO: 3619/36

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

EUROPEANS STILL CONCERNED ABOUT IMPLICATIONS OF ZERO OPTION

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 11 Mar 86 p 2

[Article by Jan Reifenberg: "After Gorbachev Proposal Once Again European Fear of 'Disengagement': NATO Partners Urge Reagan to Be Cautious"]

[Text] Brussels, 10 Mar--Political and military strategists in NATO must weigh out the consequences implied by a U.S.-USSR agreement on the gradual elimination and destruction of the two superpowers' medium-range missiles stationed in Europe. The United States' chief negotiators in Geneva have reported to the NATO Council on the situation in the talks up to the conclusion of the fourth round. This ended with a cautiously positive assessment of the prospects for success on the issue of medium-range missiles by U.S. delegation leader Kampelman and with the accusation by his Soviet partner, Karpov, that Washington still owes a response to Gorbachev's disarmament proposal of 15 January. This was intended for public opinion. In the confidential realm of the Geneva negotiations, however, an initial and careful comparison of Gorbachev's proposals and Reagan's response of 26 February has taken place. It now remains to be seen how the Kremlin leadership will respond to the American proposals, and in particular whether they will agree to the strict demand for credible inspection of the elimination and destruction of SS-20 positions in Europe and Asia or whether it will turn out to be the case that Gorbachev's proposals were basically only part of an ongoing psychological offensive designed to disengage Europe from the United States. For the time being, there is acceptance in NATO circles of the American view that the USSR can be taken at its word only if it is open to verification of the elimination of the medium-range missile threat aimed at Western Europe. Furthermore, it is necessary in the weeks and months ahead to find out whether an agreement in this area is really so important that he would separate it from the previous precondition concerning an agreement on future defensive arms in space.

It is to the credit of the European NATO partners that Reagan broke away from from his initial positive response to Gorbachev's proposal in favor of a "globalization" of the medium-range missile issue. Objections by Japan (and China) to limiting a future agreement to Europe also made a difference in Washington during the formulation of the President's response of 26 January. NATO experts clearly understand that Reagan initially wanted--for political reasons, which have to do with his planned second summit with Gorbachev in the

United States--to take the party secretary at his word, without consideration of the overall strength of the SS-20 missiles. Behind this is the American realization, often expressed since the beginning of the counterarmament decision, that the SS-20s do not directly threaten the United States, and that their positions are at any rate "covered" from there and from sea by American nuclear arms. In all fairness, it should not be forgotten that the stationing of the "Pershing II" missiles and of the cruise missiles in the FRG, Italy, Great Britain, Belgium and, beginning in 1988, in the Netherlands was a political decision intended to demonstrate the inseparable connection between the security of the United States and that of Europe. Nor should it be forgotten that the parallel proposals focusing on the "zero option" were supposed to help then-Chancellor Schmidt to make clear to his unruly party the necessity of counterarmament. Thus, the European fear of disengagement that is again becoming apparent since Gorbachev's proposal is not lacking in irony, even though it shows that it has in the meantime become clear what the discontinuance of a strategically valid response to the SS-20s would mean for the defense of Western Europe.

"Looking into the Soviets' Kitchen"

In the political and military headquarters of the alliance, there is special appreciation of the danger to which the European central front would be subjected if it were to remain exposed to a continued threat by Soviet short-range missiles like the SS-21 (with a range of up to 100 km), the SS-23 (range of up to 360 km) and the SS-12/22 (with a range of nearly 1,000 km). The danger is increased by the fact that these weapons can be equipped with highly modern conventional as well as nuclear and chemical warheads. From their positions in the GDR and Czechoslovakia, they cover almost all of Western Europe. From the standpoint of the NATO supreme commander, these are first-strike weapons of the type that Moscow refuses to allow the West to have in Europe. Indications by Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze that these short-range missiles could similarly be part of an agreement on the elimination of the SS-20 on the "European front" have thus far not been put into concrete terms at Geneva. And even if, in accordance with Reagan's idea, the stock of short-range and tactical weapons on both sides in Europe is "frozen," the question is still not resolved.

For NATO strategists, the question of "coupling" remains of the highest priority: They are keeping in mind the fact that on the average the United States would be 4,000 km away from the closest NATO targets, while Soviet forces, after a withdrawal to behind its national borders, would be only around 600 km away. If the "Pershing II" and cruise missiles were to be stored in the United States, they would have to be brought back during a crisis, in which case there is the question of what political climate would then be prevalent in the countries of Western Europe. In the meantime, the USSR would have in its hands a considerable tool, in both political and military terms, for extorting Western Europe and would have cheaply gotten rid of an effective response to the SS-20. Moscow's willingness to allow inspections is certainly tempting--whereby it is unclear to what extent the Soviets, to use Khrushchev's expression, are ready to allow the West to "look into their kitchen." But then the question of the French and British national nuclear arms systems would remain open; it is certain that Moscow will pursue

their elimination as a second goal, in order to make the security of Western Europe even more dependent on good behavior towards Moscow.

This is why London and Paris are taking a hard look these days at what the consequences would be of a U.S.-USSR agreement on the gradual elimination and destruction of the medium-range missiles of the two superpowers in Europe for their own strategies. This because Gorbachev's demand for a "halt in modernization" of the French and British nuclear arms systems means in the case of Britain that the British navy would have to do without being armed with the modern American Trident missiles--which the Labour opposition of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is demanding anyway. France, which foresees a far-reaching conversion of its national deterrence force (force de dissuasion) to intercontinental weapons with multiple warheads on atomic submarines, has other concerns. It is true that it is not dependent on American supplies. And yet, what would happen if, within the framework of a U.S.-USSR agreement on limited defense in space or on protecting respective missile positions, the primary targets of the "force de dissuasion" were no longer strikable? Would the enormous expenditures for security based on a national decision be for nothing in a conflict situation? And what guarantee would Europe and France have that the United States, as it at least for now remains part of the conceivable conflict scenario, would risk its own existence for Europe? All these questions have been raised once again and with urgency by Gorbachev's and Reagan's plans. Answering them is all the more difficult in view of the fact that there is still no separate European defense system against the threat to the old continent that could significantly supplement in part any future actualization of Reagan's SDI plan and thus gain political significance.

12271

CSO: 5200/2657

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET AMBASSADOR ASKS BRAZIL FOR DISARMAMENT SUPPORT

FY230208 Rio de Janeiro O GLOBO in Portuguese 21 Mar 86 p 15

[Text] Brasilia -- Soviet Ambassador Vladimir Chernyshev yesterday addressed the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies Foreign Relations Committee and asked for Brazilian support for the Soviet nuclear disarmament proposal, which has been rejected by the U.S. Government. Brazil's support was sought because it "enjoys a recognized international prestige." In search of this support for the Soviet disarmament proposals, which were approved during the 27th CPSU Congress in January (as published), Ambassador Chernyshev has met with President Jose Sarney, and the presidents of the Chamber of Deputies and Senate, Ulysses Guimarães and Jose Fragelli, respectively. During yesterday's speech the Soviet ambassador criticized the "reactionary forces of the imperialist world" which are stimulating war and the arms race to preserve their power and impose their will on people.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2011

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR'S SEMEYKO DISCUSSES EUROPEAN SECURITY PROBLEMS

PM201414 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Lev Semeyko article under the rubric "Europe -- Our Common Home": "Unraveling the Nuclear Knot"]

[Text] The CPSU and the Soviet state regard Europe as one of the main dimensions of international politics. "Europe's historical chances and future lie in peaceful co-operation among the continent's states," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress stresses. "And it is important, while preserving the capital already accumulated, to move on: from the initial phase to a more stable phase of detente, to mature detente, and then to the creation of reliable security on the basis of the Helsinki process and a radical reduction in nuclear and conventional arms." In striving for the achievement of this lofty and noble objective and advancing a new program for nuclear disarmament the Soviet Union is proposing the implementation of a number of corresponding measures precisely in Europe. This is no coincidence.

All classes of nuclear arms -- tactical, medium-range, and strategic -- are represented on the Old Continent. This is the continent on which the nuclear arsenals of four of the five nuclear powers are concentrated. These arsenals of enormous aggregate might are capable of practically destroying European civilization.

Europe is a continent where security problems have posed particularly acutely for many reasons, and primarily because of the acuteness of the nuclear confrontation. This is why the USSR is proposing the beginning of the consistent freeing of Europe from nuclear weapons at the very first stage of the comprehensive disarmament program. The point of departure could be the elimination of the medium-range Soviet and American nuclear missiles deployed in the European zone. "If, without procrastinating or complicating the matter with other problems, it proved successful to eliminate the Soviet and American medium-range missiles on our continent, we would unravel maybe one of the complex knots of current world politics and clear the way to a considerable extent to the radical reduction and subsequent complete elimination of nuclear weapons," was how M.S. Gorbachev described the importance of the European aspect of nuclear disarmament.

The USSR is proposing consistent steps during whose implementation at each stage of nuclear disarmament maximum consideration would be given to all sides' security interests. At the very first stage, the USSR and the United States as the most powerful nuclear powers could set an example by completely eliminating the European ballistic and medium-range cruise missile potential. In what way is this proposal new?

First, it is not an isolated proposal but part of a general and precisely coordinated program for nuclear disarmament and must be implemented at the same time as a halving of the USSR and U.S. nuclear arsenals which can reach each other's territory. Second, such a major reduction in the nuclear threat enables our country to take a more flexible approach to the question of taking account of the Anglo-French nuclear forces, whose significance remains in full.

The proposal advanced by the USSR is that the United States should assume a commitment not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries (let us remember, for example, the plans to supply Trident-2 missiles to Britain). In turn, Britain and France should pledge not to build up their nuclear arms (let us again remember that, according to existing estimates, the number of these powers' nuclear warheads is to increase by more than 1,000 by the beginning of the nineties). Otherwise universal security would be undermined as a result of NATO attempts to safeguard only its "own" security -- and moreover, by methods of building up arms.

Washington must realize that without security for the USSR there cannot be security for the United States, and without security for the Warsaw Pact countries there cannot be security for the NATO countries. In view of this the USSR has a right to expect realism and sense in British and French policy. The solution of problems of universal security require a common approach.

The measures proposed for the second stage, which is to begin no later than 1990 and last 5-7 years, are also in keeping with the interests of the equal security of the sides and consistent nuclear disarmament. After the USSR and the United States have completed the 50-percent reduction of their corresponding arms, all the nuclear powers will eliminate their tactical nuclear weapons with a range (radius of action) of 1,000 km. At least two factors are important here. First, the Soviet Union takes account of the position held by Britain and France whereby they would be prepared to join the nuclear disarmament process after a considerable reduction in the level of the Soviet and American nuclear potentials. As we can see, the USSR is in no way insisting on an immediate reduction in the Anglo-French nuclear forces. Second, if at the second stage Britain and France eliminate only their tactical nuclear means, the USSR and the United States would not only take analogous steps but would also implement further measures to eliminate medium-range nuclear arms. However the American allies would retain such arms. In other words, their security is in no way undermined in comparison with the present situation.

Finally, at the third stage (no later than 1995) it is proposed that the elimination of all remaining nuclear arms be completed so that not a single nuclear charge would remain on earth by the beginning of the 21st century.

In other words, the USSR's approach to the nature of nuclear disarmament measures is bold yet exceptionally delicate. It convincingly demonstrates a readiness to take into consideration the interests of not only its own security but also that of its partners in the disarmament process.

In order to accelerate to the maximum the reaching of agreements on medium-range missiles, the USSR has agreed at the Geneva talks to separate the question of these means from questions of space and strategic nuclear weapons. This is yet another favorable precondition for making a start this very year on freeing Europe from nuclear weapons and completely eliminating them in the world.

Unfortunately there is still no desire to acknowledge this in Washington. In response to the Soviet proposals, the United States has advanced a somewhat updated version of its previous "zero option" of 1981. The American "zero" is one-sidedly beneficial to the United States and NATO.

It is in keeping with the selfish interests of the United States and its allies in the Far East since it envisages the elimination of Soviet medium-range missiles in Asia too, whereas the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union there would not be reduced in any way. The current variant of the "zero" option is only new insofar as the United States envisages a 3-year timetable for its implementation. The question of eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe is essentially being blocked by invoking the British and French position and demanding the weakening of our defenses in the east of the country while the American military forces in that region would be retained.

The British Conservative government is in solidarity with the unconstructive American position. London is talking about the "unacceptability" of the Soviet proposals since allegedly the question of the limitation of the British nuclear forces can become a subject of discussion only after the completion of the Soviet-American Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

The overt and covert opposition of the U.S. leaders and some of their allies to the Soviet proposals cannot fail to put one on guard. Confirmation was provided by the U.S. President's radio address to Americans at the end of February. Calls for "a strong America" and new arms buildups again issued from the White House chief's lips. But what is needed today is not more leaps in the arms race but new political thinking and practical steps in the matter of complete and universal nuclear disarmament.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1305

RELATED ISSUES

INTERNATIONAL PEACE MEETING HELD IN MOSCOW

LD170434 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 16 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 16 TASS -- The third information meeting-dialogue of Soviet political and public figures, prominent scientists and experts on disarmament problems with representatives of anti-war organizations and movements of Western Europe, the U.S. and Canada was held in Moscow on March 15 through 16. It was organized by the Soviet Peace Committee and the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The meeting was attended by 120 representatives of 114 mass peace movements of various political and ideological outlooks.

They discussed in detail the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 and the concept of all-embracing security set forth in the statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, of January 15 and in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th CPSU Congress, as well as the state and prospects of Soviet-American relations, questions connected with the consolidation of security and the prevention of the arms race in space.

Participants in the meeting emphasized in their reports that the package of new Soviet peace initiatives had met with a positive response on the part of all the true peace champions irrespective of their political and ideological convictions. Those initiatives promote the solution of a tangle of contradictions of the present-day world, open up a concrete prospect of liberating humanity from the burden of the arms race and give clear guidelines in the struggle for peace and security for all.

The meeting devoted much attention to the discussion of questions connected with cooperation of peace-minded forces, the consolidation of their unity in the struggle for the prevention of a thermonuclear war and of the militarization of space.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV RECEIVES ITALY'S JOTTI, VIEWS WORLD SITUATION

LD251440 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 25 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 25 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today received Leonilde Jotti, president of the Chamber of Deputies of the Italian Parliament and a member of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, who is paying a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Appraising the international situation, which had become even more complex over the past few weeks, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union had not received any satisfactory reply to its proposals aimed at ridding mankind of the nuclear threat. The West's unwillingness to end the race with any armaments and to seek accords on their reduction seriously and on the basis of equality has become clear. He stressed that a responsible approach to politics presupposed readiness actually to reckon with the realities of the new stage of modern history, with the national interests of all states, and respect for the will of one's own people and other peoples and for the world public opinion. Mutual security nowadays calls upon everyone for a new way of thinking and for an understanding of the fact that it can only be achieved by political means, through negotiations. We should learn to live together in today's complex world. Today's international politics need especially strict respect for and a serious attitude to accords and prevention of actions which are worsening the situation, dangerous as it is. Leonilde Jotti outlined the goals of her visit to the USSR, one of them being the extension of direct contacts between parliaments in order to promote peace and rapprochement between the peoples of the two countries, and spoke in favour of more efforts in various forms on the way to detente so as to put an end to the escalation of the nuclear threat and to the squandering of huge resources on military purposes.

The participants in the meeting, which passed in an atmosphere of friendship, reiterated their mutual desire for the continuation of the Soviet-Italian dialogue in order further to develop good relations and cooperation between the USSR and Italy. Italy's ambassador to the USSR, Sergio Romano, was present at the meeting.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

USSR VIEWS REAGAN'S APPEAL ON DEFENSE SPENDING

'Confrontationist Rhetoric'

PH281935 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 86 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Whipping Up the Arms Race"]

[Text] Washington, 27 Feb -- At a time when appeals to the reason and conscience of all mankind are resounding from the rostrum of the 27th CPSU Congress in the name of ending the arms race and eliminating the threat of nuclear annihilation that hangs over mankind, Washington has openly proclaimed its intention to continue its militarist course. Appearing on national television, President Reagan declared that the administration will not allow any cuts whatever in the military budget's growth rates either in the current fiscal year or in the next. Praising the results of the long-term program being implemented by the administration to "modernize America's military might," which has already cost \$1 trillion, the President especially credited himself with the creation of new generations of arms in the United States, such as MX first-strike ballistic missiles, the Trident system, and B-1B and Stealth bombers, and the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on the territory of Western European countries.

Taking into account the mounting alarm, both inside and outside the United States, at the administration's policy of increasing military-political tension, the President tried to portray things as though the United States needs the unrestrained buildup of military muscle for...the success of the talks with the Soviet Union. "Preparations for war are one of the most effective means of preserving peace," the President claimed. "Strength is the most persuasive argument we have to convince our opponents to negotiate in earnest. Now that we are sitting at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union, let us not deprive America of the trump card."

R. Reagan publicized the White House's recently advanced "new" proposal in the sphere of limiting medium-range missiles, which is a rehash of the notorious "zero option" aimed at ensuring unilateral military advantages for the United States. He once again campaigned for the militarization of space, insisting on the speediest implementation of his "star wars" program, and he essentially made the adoption of the program a condition for resolving the question of reducing strategic arms. The U.S. President made it unequivocally clear that the administration has not the slightest intention of confining itself to so-called research in the sphere of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" and is already planning to create [sozdaniye] real space weapons systems without delay. "We have to translate our lead at the laboratory level into a lead in terms of specific arms," he declared.

In order to justify the policy of militarization and the pursuit of military superiority, the head of the administration returned to confrontationist rhetoric, falsifications, and crude slander against the Soviet Union. He claimed that in the seventies the United States had all but disarmed unilaterally, while "the Russians alone were running the arms race," "forgetting" the well-known fact that the Soviet Union had merely been forced to respond to the new arms systems developed by Washington. He tried to portray the successes of national liberation and anti-imperialist movements -- a natural historical process -- as a result of "Moscow's intrigues" and as evidence of "the Russians' aggressiveness." "We set out to show that there will come an end to the long string of governments coming under communist domination. And we are achieving this," he declared, citing as an example of the "success" of his policy the "liberation" of Grenada, which the whole world branded as an example of unconcealed armed aggression against a sovereign independent state.

Reagan demanded that members of Congress abandon the very idea of reducing the rates of growth of U.S. military spending. "We have acted together these past 5 years. So let us continue in the same spirit," he declared. Reagan also demanded that military aid to U.S. stooges "in strategically important regions" not be cut. "Our friends," he cynically declared, "can fulfill many tasks at a far cheaper price than we ourselves." What kind of tasks and what kind of price can be seen from the praise the President lavished on the enemies of the peoples of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, and Ethiopia and the mercenaries whom the administration supplies with weapons and money and drives to the slaughter in the name of implementing the American imperialist doctrine of neoglobalism."

Observers point out that the chief purpose of Reagan's speech is to prevent a cut in military spending that would threaten the profits of the U.S. military-industrial complex. J. Wright, leader of the Democratic majority in the Congress' House of Representatives, declared: If Congress agrees to the growth rate for the military budget proposed by the Reagan administration, then at the end of this decade we will be spending almost four times as much on military purposes as at the height of the Vietnam war. THE NEW YORK TIMES called the President's speech a means of putting political pressure on Congress to secure a shift in the argument that has flared up in the United States over the military budget, pointing out that "support for the policy of increasing military spending has weakened" in the United States, including in Congress, as a result of the summit meeting. And a high-ranking White House spokesman was forced to confirm this opinion when he described the President's speech as "a further effort to push the military budget through Congress."

Congressional Criticism Noted

LD281644 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 28 TASS -- The patently militaristic appeals made by President Reagan on national television have drawn criticism from American politicians and from the press of the United States and other countries.

Notable American Senator Gary Hart stated that the President was pushing the country onto a militarist path, paved with good intentions and gold bricks. However, the United States has already followed this path during five years, and has paid dearly. The military budget, according to the senator, is worsening the federal budget deficit, which it had created in the first place. Now the President calls for an 11 per cent rise in the military budget. Hart pointed out that even the Republicans considered such a rise unrealistic.

House member Patricia Schroeder noted that none of the measures suggested by the administration to cut the colossal budget deficit affected the Pentagon's multibillion military programs. According to Schroeder, she will co-sponsor with House member Ronald Dellums an alternative military budget which will define priorities and areas essential to the security of America.

"President Reagan's emotionally televised appeal for his defense spending proposals ran head-on into a deeply ingrained public attitude that the military buildup under his administration has involved a large amount of waste and should be slowed," THE WASHINGTON POST says. Reagan claimed, according to the newspaper, that he had taken over a country which had "suffered" from military spending cuts over the years. The Pentagon's documents show, however, that U.S. military spending was steadily growing virtually throughout the 1970s.

New York, February 28 TASS -- "It's even a violation of Mr. Reagan's legal responsibilities for him to refuse to discuss a moratorium or a test ban with Moscow," THE NEW YORK TIMES says.

"In both the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, the U.S. is solemnly pledged to work and negotiate for an end to all nuclear tests for all time." The newspaper says that the ending of nuclear tests would make the development of new nuclear weapons far more difficult, if not impossible, and says: "precisely for that reason Ronald Reagan does not want a test ban."

Paris, February 28 TASS -- President Reagan "repeated his old arguments and returned to his erstwhile concept of the 'evil empire,'" L'HUMANITE says. "It is symptomatic that he spoke on television immediately after Mikhail Gorbachev had delivered the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the Congress of the Soviet Communists, reiterating the Soviet program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The presidential statement constitutes a de facto reply to the Soviet peace proposals. The head of the U.S. Administration is finding it harder and harder to win over to his side the public and is likely to face serious difficulties at the forthcoming congressional and Senate elections."

Further on Congressional Criticism

LD021013 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 1 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, March 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutyy reports: President Ronald Reagan's recent militaristic speech on television has drawn harsh criticism from members of U.S. Congress.

Senator William Proxmire said President Reagan was basically wrong when he went on talking about a U.S. military lag behind the Soviet Union. The United States, the senator argued, did not need any extra appropriations for military needs, which its chief executive was calling for. The United States, Proxmire stressed, should conduct arms control talks from positions of military parity.

Congressman Sander Levin said Reagan in his speech had tried to give the nation and Congress a scare with his claims about "Soviet threat". But even a high-ranking administration spokesman who held a news conference for journalists before that speech, Levin added, had conceded there was an essential military equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the United States. The truth was, the congressman remarked, that the United States had adequate defense capability.

Congressman Barbara Boxer said, for her part, that the United States did not need at all to add further billions of dollars to its already outsize military budget. She cited latest public opinion surveys as showing that 59 percent of Americans consider military spending unreasonably high and think it necessary to axe it to reduce the enormous Federal budget deficit.

'Counterstrike' To Soviet Proposals

PM121611 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Mar 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by M. Knyazkov: "When the Ground Disappears From Under Your Feet..."]

[Excerpts] The broad peace program put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress seriously alarmed Washington.

However, it probably could not have been otherwise. The Kremlin's new clear and comprehensive proposal to ensure peoples' security met with a lively response in the hearts of millions of people on earth, including those in the United States. It is precisely for this reason that the White House decided to make a counterstrike by launching a powerful propaganda campaign that is still continuing to this day. A TASS correspondent tells SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA readers about this.

The day after M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered his Political Report, President Reagan appeared on American television. It was as if Geneva had never been and as if no speech had been made afterward to both houses of Congress, in which the U.S. President swore to strive to conclude effective agreements on arms control and to improve Soviet-American relations. The master of the White House once again rammed it into Americans that, quote: "The Soviets only respect those who speak the language of force with them" and tried to put the blame for the arms race on the USSR.

Nevertheless, paradoxical as it may seem, this bellicose speech was more a demonstration of the Reagan administration's weakness of than a show of its strength. It was a kind of rearguard battle by Washington in the face of the broad Soviet peace offensive, which is supported by an increasing number of Americans and has been given powerful new impetus by the 27th CPSU Congress.

As THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, Reagan's closest advisers urgently recommended that he make this speech. And this is why. "Secret public opinion polls," the newspaper points out, "have registered a drop in public support for the arms buildup program that Reagan has conducted throughout his presidency."

Yes, the series of constructive Soviet initiatives, such as, for example, the moratorium on nuclear explosions or the proposal to enter the 21st century without nuclear weapons, are beginning to knock the ground from beneath the feet of arms race supporters. That is why Washington's propaganda attack on the effective peace and security program put forward at the CPSU Congress has boomeranged into criticism of the U.S. Administration. "Deceiving People" -- this is how Tom Wicker, prominent American columnist, headed his commentary on the president's speech.

Of course, the American press is a distorting mirror. And it is difficult to get a complete and, above all, objective picture of events in Moscow through that press. Nevertheless, it is noticeable how avidly Americans seize on reports from the Soviet capital, seeking in them an answer to the questions troubling all mankind.

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: U.S. CONGRESSMEN SUPPORT DISARMAMENT APPEAL

LD111030 Moscow TASS in English 1012 GMT 11 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 11 TASS -- A group of prominent American senators and representatives have expressed their support for the appeal by the leaders of six countries -- Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece -- to undertake concrete steps towards preventing an arms race in outer space and stopping it on Earth.

Senator Paul Simon, Representatives Tom Downey, Jim Leach and Barkley Bedell, at a news conference here, presented the letter addressed by the leaders of the six countries who earlier signed the "Delhi Declaration" to General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The struggle for the elimination of the nuclear menace, said Rep. Downey, is a responsibility of every man on Earth. He highly assessed the latest steps and proposals by the Soviet Union which has been observing its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear blasts from August last year, and stated its readiness to agree on corresponding compliance procedures, including on-site verification.

Downey observed with regret at the news conference that the administration refuses to heed the opinion of U.S. Congress which calls for a resumption of talks leading to a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests. In his opinion, it is the absence of political will on the part of the White House, rather than technical problems connected with verification, which stand in the way of the cessation of nuclear testing.

Everything must be done to preserve peace, said Sen. Simon. A total ban on nuclear testing is one of the steps, possible already today, towards this goal. The senator noted that verification problems are no longer a roadblock to the conclusion of an accord in the light of the latest Soviet proposals. In order to achieve at least a temporary ban on nuclear tests, he said, the president only has to lift his telephone receiver and give a call to the Kremlin.

The problem of ending nuclear tests is the question of human survival, said Rep. Bedell.

The congressmen and other participants in the news conference paid tribute to the memory of Olof Palme, an outstanding political figure who was Sweden's prime minister, slain in the evening of February 28, on the days of the signing of the letter by the leaders of the six states.

Sweden's ambassador to the United States Wilhelm Wachtmeister told the news conference that the Swedish Government remains committed to Palme's efforts to eliminate the nuclear threat.

RELATED ISSUES

'UNCONSTRUCTIVE' UK STANCE ON MISSILES ASSAILED BY IZVESTIYA

PM201100 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua article: "Independence or Shortsightedness?"]

[Text] The other day THE WASHINGTON POST published an article which started somewhat enigmatically. The newspaper wrote: "Now that all the animals and gods of the super-powers' nuclear arsenals are well known the the entire world -- all those 'poseidons' and 'titans,' 'bisons, and 'bears' -- yet another terrifying arsenal has emerged: 'hades,' 'chevalines,' and 'plutos.'" What was it talking about? French and British nuclear arms. The newspaper noted with alarm that these countries' nuclear arsenals are "growing at a sensational pace."

In this instance the definition "sensational" is by no means sensational. It is wholly adequate and gives a realistic reflection of the heart of the matter. Here are facts drawn from Western sources concerning Britain. At this stage Britain has 64 Polaris nuclear warheads. In implementing its so-called "modernization" program, the British Navy is building a new submarine fleet, including 4 submarines equipped with 16 Trident missiles, each of which will carry 8 individually targetable warheads, and is equipping 4 submarines with 64 new Chevaline missiles carrying 2 warheads each. Construction of new nuclear-capable Tornado jet aircraft is also under way. As a result of the implementation of the program the British Navy will have 512 nuclear warheads and Britain's total nuclear potential will reach 1,088 warheads. But it is not just a question of quantity, even though the manyfold increase in the British nuclear arsenal is sufficiently noteworthy in itself. The fact is, as the newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes, that "Trident will create the potential for inflicting a first-strike against the Soviet Union and this opinion is backed up by the privately expressed opinions of the Americans, who know more about it."

Thus, the British Isles are gripped by a strong nuclear arms race fever. Why? Perhaps they are directly threatened by invasion? In no way, unless, of course, one includes the U.S. nuclear missile infrastructure in this invasion. So what is the matter? The official standard position of the Tory government is that Britain needs an "independent deterrent."

Here is yet another example of the famed British hypocrisy. It is particularly visible in the word "independent." The nuclear arms race that Britain has launched makes it even more dependent on the United States. I can back up that statement. Here are certain examples that by no means exhaust the line of argument. Trident missiles will be bought from the United States. Servicing and spares will be provided from U.S. bases in Kings Bay, Georgia.

The key aspects in the planning of British submarines will depend on the U.S. concern General Dynamics. The enriched uranium used as fuel on the submarines will be bought in the United States. Tests of the modernized Trident warheads will also be held in the United States -- in Nevada. But that is by no means all. Washington will have control of the systems for planning the trajectories and targeting the missiles themselves. This will be carried out by the U.S. joint strategic staff in Omaha, Nebraska using U.S. codes. Intelligence information will be obtained from U.S. spy satellites. (British submarines will depend on U.S. Navstar satellites to fix their position before missile launch. And access to these satellites is totally controlled by Washington.)

That is the background against which British Prime Minister Thatcher replied to the 15 January Soviet proposals. She described them, according to a Press Association report, as "unacceptable." Clearly, consistency is not one of the British premier's virtues. Quite recently Mrs Thatcher advocated removing Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe and urged that the question should not be linked with strategic and space arms. She even compared such a development with "the best Christmas present possible," stalling with a story about "Greeks bearing gifts." As Mrs Thatcher stated the other day in the House of Commons, her government refuses to freeze its nuclear arms and will continue to modernize them.

The key phrase in the British premier's speech was: "If a deterrent is not modernized it stops being a deterrent." Simple logic -- and the British have always been strong on logic -- says: If deterrents are eliminated on a mutual basis, there will be nobody left to deter or to be scared. Thatcher once welcomed the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Geneva, stating that they "hold out the hope of ensuring peace worldwide." But what did she and her cabinet do to implement that hope? Nothing apart from trying to clip its wings. What London calls "modernization" is actually the sabotaging of that hope.

London's negative and unconstructive position took many Britons aback and caused indignation in the broadest circles of the British public. THE GUARDIAN described it as a "fatal and cowardly act." With unconcealed irony it wrote that London "has decided that it likes the cruise missiles that have been deployed, and if they are taken away it will feel robbed." THE GUARDIAN's irony is all the more bitter because the "modernization" organized by Thatcher will cost British taxpayers 11 billion pounds sterling. Yet Britain is now spending more per capita on military purposes than any other West European NATO member. Britain's military budget has been growing nonstop for 7 years in succession.

But the threat to Britain's national security has been growing nonstop too -- and growing appallingly, to use Mrs Thatcher's terminology. Blocking the resolution of the disarmament problem in the diplomatic sphere, particularly in Europe, and whipping up the nuclear arms race in the military sphere, the British Tory Government is showing dangerous, if not criminal, shortsightedness. Not for nothing is it said that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

While the British public is expressing its discontent at Thatcher's negative position, the Pentagon, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, is "enthusiastically supporting her." The newspaper is by no means exaggerating. That was the spirit in which the statement by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant defense secretary, was couched the other day. Well, one can understand the Pentagon: An odd missile in the anti-Soviet arsenal or an odd wrench in the works of disarmament has never bothered it. Britain's national interests are another matter. As is well known the umbrella is a constant feature of a Briton's

wardrobe, or rather, of his equipment. Now they want to turn this constant feature into a "nuclear umbrella." But whereas the first offers protection against rain, the second not only offers no protection against a nuclear downpour but might even provoke one. The best and most reliable means of avoiding this deadly downpour is to modernize thinking, not instruments of mass destruction.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA HITS NATO SHORT-RANGE MISSILES PLAN

PM171351 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Commentator's Column": "Missile Fence"]

[Text] The North Atlantic Bloc is elaborating a new nuclear arms modernization program. General B. Rogers, NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe, proposes to begin deploying new short-range nuclear missiles here after 1988.

This idea was first mentioned back in the spring of last year. However, at that time, at the height of the controversy around the planned deployment of medium-range missiles in Belgium and the Netherlands, NATO deemed it wiser not to add fuel to the fire and refrained from pushing the adoption of the new program through. Now that all the allies to whom the 1979 missile decision applies have agreed to the deployment of Pershing 2 and cruise missiles, the North Atlantic strategists, judging by appearances, are impatient to go even further.

Whatever the NATO strategists have in mind, it is obvious right now that the bloc's top brass are planning an additional buildup of their nuclear potential in Europe. The program for this buildup extends through 1995 and makes provision for the implementation of a series of measures. Their essence is the further transformation of our continent into a "theater of military operations" and of the West Europeans themselves into Washington's nuclear hostages.

It is no accident that it is planned to begin to implement NATO's new dangerous venture after 1988. It is envisaged that by that time the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles which is currently under way will be finished. The new missiles, tactical nuclear "surface-to-surface" and "air-to-surface" missiles in this case, will also be American. Consequently, control over them will again rest with the Pentagon. And the profits from their development and production will go to U.S. arms manufacturers.

Setting forth his program, B. Rogers would not avoid mentioning the latest Soviet peace initiatives which are diametrically opposed to NATO's course toward an unrestrained buildup of nuclear arsenals. As was to be expected, he called on the allies not to agree, under any circumstances, to the elimination of medium-range missiles from Europe or to a renunciation of all types of nuclear arms.

In this way he once again showed how stubbornly NATO intends to oppose any constructive efforts to end the nuclear arms race. No matter how hard NATO propaganda tries to present this bloc as a "guarantor of peace," the North Atlanticists' concrete actions, the missile fence which they are putting up in Europe, and other militarist ventures remain the main obstacle to building a truly stable and safe world, a world without weapons.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

IZVESTIYA EDITORIAL ON SOVIET DISARMAMENT POLICY

PM241704 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The 27th CPSU Congress on the Struggle for Disarmament"]

[Text] Is there anyone among us who does not wish for peace for his own home? Is there anyone who does not strive for a better, purer, and fairer life? No, there are no such people!

The plans drawn up by the 27th congress are daring, the scale of the deeds to be accomplished is grand. But our responsibility to history is even greater.

The leaders of modern imperialism are aware that each one of our successes and each victory in the struggle for the goals and ideals of Great October strengthens the potential for peace and progress on a worldwide scale. Imperialism perceives this as a threat to its very existence. So it embarks on attempts to halt the march of history, to undermine the positions of socialism, and to gain social revenge on a worldwide scale. It does not shrink from direct crimes against mankind. "The gravest crime committed by imperialism against the peoples," the CPSU Program emphasizes, "is the race in nuclear and other arms which it has unleashed on an unprecedented scale."

The consequences are obvious. The race has already led to an excessively high level of the balance of nuclear potentials. So far only equal danger is ensured for each of the opposing sides at this level. But the continuation of the arms race can only enhance this equal danger and take it to limits at which parity ceases to be a factor of restraint.

Consequently, it is primarily necessary to greatly reduce the level of military confrontation and to guarantee really equal security at the lowest possible level of strategic balance.

Under conditions when imperialism continues to count on achieving military superiority over the USSR and the socialist community, one of our most important tasks is to continue maintaining our Armed Forces at a level that rules out any superiority by the forces of imperialism.

But socialism has never of its own will tied its future to military solutions of international problems. Our ideal is a world without weapons or violence.

This ideal contains a concentrated expression of the humanism of communist ideology and its lofty moral values. This ideal contains the CPSU's aspiration to set man free for creative purposes.

The CPSU and the Soviet state link progress in this direction with disarmament as one of the most important foundations of international security in general. In this connection the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress stressed the growing need to resolve the task of outlawing nuclear weapons and totally eliminating means of mass destruction.

This is a task of a truly world historic scale. It is a task on which the answer to the question of whether mankind will exist or not depends.

World War I, which was unleashed by imperialism, enveloped 38 states. The result was 10 million killed and 28 billion dollars in damage from the destruction of material assets.

World War II enveloped 72 states. The result was 55 million killed and 316 billion dollars in damage.

Today imperialism is creating the threat of a third world war. If it is not prevented it will not bypass a single state and, as a result of the direct effects of nuclear strikes alone, could kill at least half of mankind.

In order to prevent this it is necessary to resolutely and irrevocably break with the type of thinking and actions which for centuries were built on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts. This necessitates a new philosophy of security corresponding to the demands of the nuclear space and a platform of concrete actions for the sake of saving the earth from nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons.

The program -- historic in terms of its scale and importance -- for totally eliminating mass destruction weapons by the end of this century and preventing the danger of war put forward in the 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee is an organic fusion of the philosophy of shaping a secure world with a reliable platform of concrete actions. The 27th Congress proclaimed the struggle to implement that program as the central avenue for the USSR's foreign policy in the years ahead.

The plan for concrete action which is put forward in the statement, a plan with a strict time course, demonstrates the USSR's desire to act in the military sphere in such a way as to ensure that nobody has any grounds to fear for their own security or doubts as to the purely defensive thrust of Soviet military doctrine. But both our country and our allies must equally be spared from feeling a threat.

In this connection it was stated at the 27th CPSU Congress: The Soviet Union is in favor of removing weapons of mass destruction from circulation and of confronting military potential within the bounds of a reasonable sufficiency. But since these bounds continue to be limited by the positions and actions of the United States and its partners in military blocs, our country's principled position is defined by a clear, laconic formula: The Soviet Union does not claim greater security and will not accept lesser security.

The USSR approaches the American "star wars" program from this position too. The Soviet Communists' congress stressed once again: It is extremely necessary, before it is too late, to seek a solution guaranteeing us against the transfer of the arms race into space.

The Soviet Union proceeds on the basis that a sharp reduction in nuclear potential could help substantially in overcoming this obstacle to radical disarmament. The resolution of the question of medium-range missiles in the European zone separately could be a real step in this direction. The possibility of an accord also exists on the question of ending nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union is not merely ready for such accords in the most important avenues of arms limitation and reduction -- it actively seeks them. This desire is confirmed by the USSR's decision not to carry out nuclear explosions even after 31 March -- until the first nuclear explosion in the United States, as was announced after the 27th CPSU Congress in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's reply to the joint message from the leaders of the "Delhi Six."

However, it is hard to discover in the American leadership's position any serious readiness to embark in practice on the resolution of cardinal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. Yet Washington's practical actions heavily negated its assurances of its desire for peace and averting the danger of war.

The latest test explosion of a nuclear device, carried out by the Pentagon the other day, was an open challenge to mankind, which sees the ending of nuclear tests as the direct path to ending the creation of more and more new types of thermonuclear weapons and reducing the arsenals of such weapons. Here the White House has a special fondness for attempts to submerge genuine disarmament beneath verbal variations on the theme of verification. These attempts are futile. The 27th congress reaffirmed that all-embracing, very strict verification [proverka] is probably the most important component in the disarmament process, and that therefore disarmament with verification [kontrol] is impossible; but verification [kontrol] without disarmament, which is what the United States proposes, does not make sense.

What does make sense, is envisaged by the concept of an all-embracing international security system put forward in the CPSU Congress Committee Political Report to the 27th congress, is a "strictly verifiable [kontrolirumoye] lowering of the levels of states' military potentials to the limit of what is reasonably sufficient." What also makes sense, furthermore, and is envisaged by the fundamentals of such a system in the military field is the renunciation by nuclear powers of war -- both nuclear and conventional -- against each other or against third states; the prevention of an arms race in space, the termination of all nuclear weapons tests and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, and the renunciation of the creation [sozdaniye] of other means of mass destruction; the disbandment of military groupings with the prior renunciation of the expansion of or formation of new groupings; and the proportional and balanced reduction of military budgets.

But it does not all depend on us. The aims of the most egoistic groups of the U.S. ruling elite, linked with the military-industrial complex, openly conflict with the aims of our people and of all the peoples of the world, including the American people. For those circles disarmament means a loss of profits and a political risk, M.S. Gorbachev noted, whereas for us it means gains in all respects: economic, political, and moral.

Imperialist reaction's schemes and actions should not be dismissed. At the same time something else must surely be visible: that there have never been such real opportunities for preserving and consolidating peace. By pooling their efforts the peoples can and must avert the threat of nuclear destruction.

The decisive factor here will be the successful implementation of the plans and outlines put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress. Achieving the targets set by the congress will also be of great international significance. The consolidation of the material basis of our motherland's might will serve to further affirm the principle of peaceful coexistence and will make a weighty contribution to the cause of consolidating world peace.

It is this that socialism sees as its historic calling.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S TOLKUNOV INTERVIEWED ON PREVENTION OF WAR

AU131623 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 11 Mar 86 p 3

[Interview with Lev Tolkunov, CPSU Central Committee member and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union, by NOVOSTI commentator O. Trofimova: "NOVOSTI Especially for RZECZPOSPOLITA -- the Battle Against War" -- date and place not given]

[Text] [Trofimova] The Central Committee's Political Report to the 27th congress stressed that the CPSU sees the essence of its foreign policy strategy in an active participation in the battle against war. What are the conditions of this battle at its present stage?

[Tolkunov] Do you remember the warning from the congress rostrum? Nothing will be done by itself; it is necessary to fight for peace, to fight indefatigably with a view to reaching the goal.

The Communists do not delude themselves. The common home of all the inhabitants of this earth has now become too small and too fragile for waging wars and pursuing a policy of strength. It is easy to set off an explosion. The reason for increased tension and for a threat of war are not secrets stowed away in the bowels of the earth. Millions and millions of people living in various parts of our globe continue to realize more and more with each passing day that these reasons are rooted in the policy followed by Washington and some of its close allies who bank on achieving military superiority. The rightist forces believe that positions of military domination in the world constitute typical springboards that make it possible to accomplish a social tit for tat [rewanz spoleczny] and to impose systems favorable to themselves on other countries and peoples. Following the line of "nuclear rearmament" since the beginning of the eighties and seeking to realize the "star wars" program in the past few years, Washington actually continues to push mankind toward the chasm of a nuclear catastrophe.

The leadership of the CPSU and the USSR takes the view that in this new situation it is necessary to crucially change the ways of thinking and acting that have existed for centuries. It would be naive now to look for security through improving the effectiveness of the sword and the shield. In the era of nuclear missiles it is impossible to ensure security through weapons and military power. When experts continue to deliberate only on the question of how mankind can be annihilated many dozens of times over by means of the present stocks of nuclear weapons, it is high time to begin taking practical measures to abandon the policy of balancing on the

brink of war and the policy of the balance of terror and to turn toward the normal civilized standards of mutual relations and between countries possessing different social systems.

As M.S. Gorbachev said at the congress, the crucial struggle will gain in intensity in the coming years precisely in connection with the real issues of the policy capable of preserving peace. This will be a complicated and multifaceted struggle because we have to deal with the people of a country whose leading circles refuse to soberly appraise the world's reality and prospects. (One more proof in this regard is provided by the U.S. President's reply to the most recent Soviet proposals -- a reply which is full of various reservations and "conditions" and which in fact blocks efforts to resolve basic disarmament issues). The decisive factors in this struggle are the balance of forces in the international arena, the increase and militancy of the forces of peace, and these forces' ability to effectively oppose the threat of nuclear war.

At present two closely related truths, of which everyone should be aware, top the list of important issues. They state that it is impossible to win the arms race or nuclear war as such and that no other choice can be made except cooperation among all countries. This means that objective conditions have been created in which the struggle between capitalism and socialism can take place only in the form of peaceful competition.

[Trofimova] What will be the main thrust of Soviet foreign policy in the coming years?

[Tolkunov] Offering peace to all countries and peoples, the CPSU continues to fight for it every day and every hour. The socialist countries are together with us in this struggle, and peace continues to be guarded by the Warsaw Pact, the members of which are linked by common ideals of Marxism-Leninism and common security interests.

The world of socialism does not appeal to bombs and missiles. It appeals to the reason of the people no matter where they live and what ideology they profess. This appeal continues to enjoy a warm response. This has also been the case with the historic proposals on completely eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of this century and on preventing militarization of space. These proposals were made by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986.

What is it that continues to attract people to this program? The best answer to this question is the words that the leader of the Soviet Communists used in his Political Report to characterize this program: It is a combination of a philosophy that believes in creating a secure world in the era of nuclear space with a platform of specific actions. The USSR proposes that disarmament issues should be approached in a comprehensive way and that a plan for specific and precisely scheduled actions should be taken into consideration in this connection. The main task of the USSR and its socialist allies is to seek to have this plan fulfilled.

This idea was also expressed by the leaders of the fraternal parties and countries when they spoke in the Kremlin. We must not waste the historic opportunity provided by the Soviet program, the opportunity to completely free our world from nuclear weapons, Comrade Erich Honecker said.... That today Leninist foreign policy continues to provide real opportunities to ensure international security is of tremendous significance for mankind in the future, Comrade Gustav Husak said.... The peace offensive of the USSR and the countries of the socialist community continue to gain in strength, Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski said. The importance of the worldwide forces of peace and progress continues to increase.

Today, it was stressed at the congress, it is more than ever important to find ways of closer cooperation with the governments, parties, and social organizations and movements that are really interested in peace on earth. Only joint efforts will enable us to create a comprehensive system of international security. The leader of the Soviet Communists has proposed a logical structural scheme for such a system involving military, political, economic, and humanist areas. The assumptions in this connection fully correlate with the specific initiatives of socialism in foreign policy.

[Trofimova] There is no doubt that the voice of peaceful forces taking part in the great antiwar struggle is sounding louder and louder. An important role may be played here by parliaments and parliamentarians from various countries. What is being done in this direction?

[Tolkunov] We have noticed in recent years that in a series of Western countries, parliaments are participating more energetically in talks on foreign policy matters. The halls of parliaments are echoing with the voices of people demanding an end to the material and ideological preparation for a new war. Thus, the idea of a nuclear freeze, supported by broad sections of American society, possesses many adherents in the U.S. Congress. The FRG Bundestag has discussed an SPD [Social Democratic Party] motion concerning a purely peaceful use of space, which is also being supported by the "Greens" party. There is a powerful opposition inside the Netherlands parliament toward plans to deploy American cruise missiles in that country. One can mention more examples like this.

The noble aims of consolidating peace lie unchangingly at the roots of the multilateral activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, and of the USSR parliamentary group in the international arena.

Among the documents that have been approved by the Soviet parliament recently, I wish to mention two. The first of these is the resolution "On the Results of the Soviet-U.S. Summit in Geneva and on the International Situation," adopted by N.S. Gorbachev at the recent USSR Supreme Soviet session. The second document is the message to the U.S. Congress containing an appeal to support Moscow's program for total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons and a proposal for a bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium on all kinds of explosions as the first step in this direction.

In the new version of the CPSU Program, the party proclaims a line aimed at consolidating the international relations of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which includes developing contacts between their legislative bodies.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is devoting particular attention to the expansion of contacts and exchange of experience with the supreme bodies of authority in the fraternal countries. Periodic meetings between the chairmen of parliamentary groups have become a good tradition. In May of last year, the parliaments of the Warsaw Pact member-states called on the parliaments of Europe and the world to participate in a partnerlike way in the struggle against the danger of nuclear annihilation. Their work schedule is also rich with various undertakings this year, which has been declared International Peace Year by the United Nations.

[Trofimova] You are also chairman of the influential Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation. How do you view this committee's work since the CPSU congress?

[Tolkunov] The committee will continue to work but with 10 times the energy, mobilizing Soviet society to join the struggle against the nuclear threat in Europe. We are guided by the principle established at the 27th CPSU Congress whereby Europe's future involves peaceful cooperation between its states. It is important to preserve the

capital we have accumulated and at the same time move forward -- toward mature detente and permanent security based on the process that was started in Helsinki.

The words of M.S. Gorbachev may become a slogan for our work: We must by all means achieve success in the struggle against war, a success that will be a historic victory for all mankind and every person on earth.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ZAGLADIN EVALUATES RESULTS OF CPSU CONGRESS

PM201643 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 10, 17 Mar 86 pp 3-6

[Article by Vadim Zagladin: "The Party Congress: Hope and Confidence; Notes of a Delegate"]

[Excerpt]

On March 1, the 27th CPSU Congress passed its halfway point. Discussion of the first items on the agenda was completed, a resolution approved on the Central Committee Political Report, and the new text of the party programme and amendments to the party rules were adopted. On March 3, Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov delivered his report on the Basic Guidelines for economic and social development of the country, and at this writing the debate on it is in full swing.

There is still another angle to the comment on the congress decisions relating to the internal political evolution of the country and its economic development. The reference is to those Western commentators who have discerned in our economic plans a "Soviet threat." In what precisely do they see this threat?

The logic of their reasoning (if it can be called that) is this: the Soviet plans envisage a growth of the country's economic potential, hence its military potential and, consequently, the "Soviet military threat" will also grow. Add to this the diverse, utterly unfounded discourses on the subject of the possible "expansionist" plans of Soviet policy in one or another region of the world.

All this could be dismissed as sheer invention. However, since views of this order are being vigorously and persistently circulated, a few more words should be added.

First of all, no attentive reader of the Political Report of the Central Committee, the report delivered by Ryzhkov, and the draft guidelines for the economic and social development of the country (by the time this issue comes off the press the last-mentioned will no longer be a draft, but the finalized document) can fail to see that the emphasis in all our plans is on peaceful construction. The main stress is placed on the creation of the groundwork for meeting the material and spiritual requirements of man, his all-round development.

As a matter of fact, much has been said on this score at the congress. It has been pointed out that not enough attention was paid to the social and cultural sphere and that now this omission has to be rectified and attention to this area sharply increased.

Incidentally, these are not merely wishes voiced by the delegates. The problem has already been tackled in practice. Even before the congress, following the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, our party took a number of decisions on focusing more attention on social and cultural problems. Additional funds, materials and manpower — in a word, everything needed to get things going properly — have been allocated for this purpose.

Thus, our plans are not projected at the militarization of the country, but at its peaceful development. Where, then, does the "military threat" come in?

Needless to say, the growth of our economic potential increases our capability to protect our interests, to keep our defences at the necessary level.

Here too it is a matter of defence, not of aggressive designs. The Political Report of the Central Committee clearly declared that the importance we attach to ensuring our security is only natural. We could not act otherwise. For it is nobody's secret that the Pentagon already has plans for the militarization of the United States all the way to the 21st century. Nor is it a secret that there exist old plans for war against our country and that new ones are being drawn up.

It is enough to read the U.S. President's February 26 address to the nation to see that, as distinct from what is happening at our congress, Washington is orienting not on the new realities, but on the outdated and dangerous positions-of-strength concept.

We regard the Soviet-American contacts that have begun with a high sense of responsibility and have no intention of closing the doors to them. This was underscored at the party forum. But we cannot ignore the fact that, although we now and again hear words about peace — and words, even the finest, are only words — the material preparation of war goes on, with the Soviet Union named as the potential enemy. We see all this and shall never close our eyes to it.

As regards the military sphere, our intentions are defensive and our object is to ensure the security of our country and nothing more. Our military potential is limited to reasonable adequacy. But "the character and level of the ceiling," Mikhail Gorbachev said, "continues to be limited by the attitude and actions of the U.S.A. and its bloc partners. In these circumstances we repeat over and over again: the Soviet Union lays no claim to greater security than that enjoyed by others, but it will not settle for less."

Thus, all talk about our country presenting a "military threat" is sheer nonsense. Nonsense that has essentially only one purpose: to justify the further escalation of war preparations by the United States and some of its allies.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER EDITORIAL ON PEACE EFFORTS

PH200929 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Mar 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Strategy of Universal Security"]

[Text] The appeal for peace and the peoples' security rang out with new force from Moscow, from the platform of the 27th CPSU Congress. This impassioned appeal prompted every sensible person to think about this question: Can mankind escape the nuclear danger, or will imperialism's policy of confrontation, leading to the increased likelihood of nuclear conflict, gain the upper hand?

The Soviet Union's firm determination to uphold a peaceful future for the peoples was expressed convincingly in the Political Report to the congress, delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Numerous responses to this document from various corners of the globe indicate that people of good will received it as a program for the development of universal security. Even our ideological opponents and enemies are forced to recognize the the unswerving desire of the Land of the Soviets to find ways of improving international relations.

At the Soviet Communists' forum and in the new edition of the CPSU Program which the congress adopted, a profoundly scientific, Marxist-Leninist characterization of the modern world was given. It is marked by a complex, multifaceted approach, dynamism, and the existence of opposing trends and contradictions. The social shifts of our age are changing the conditions for future social development. Mankind's progress is impossible without socialism. World socialism is a mighty international formation built on a highly developed economy, a solid scientific base, and a reliable military-political potential. Socialism not only constantly improves social relations, demonstrating the real humanism of the entire tenor of its life. It erects an increasingly firm barrier against the ideology and politics of war and militarism, reaction and violence, and against all forms of misanthropy, and actively promotes social progress.

At the same time the 27th CPSU Congress drew the conclusion that in present-day conditions imperialism represents a growing threat to mankind's very existence. The world of capital is finding it difficult to understand the realities of our times and has not renounced the ideology and politics and hegemonism. Imperialism is prompted to translate the competition between the two systems into the language of military confrontation by the desire for social revanche, its own inner mainsprings, and its very socioeconomic nature. The problems and crises experienced by capitalism arise within itself and are the logical result of the inner antagonistic contradictions of an old society. Being unable to cope with the exacerbating problems of the descending

phase of capitalism's development, the ruling circles of imperialist countries resort to methods and means which are undoubtedly incapable of saving a society doomed by history itself. Imperialism, the Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress stresses, constantly generates an aggressive adventurist policy by virtue of its social nature.

The U.S. ruling circles are particularly attached to the policy of total opposition and military confrontation. They are noted for their aggressive military behavior, the growing militarization of policy and thought, and disregard for other people's interests. The United States is the locomotive of militarism.

The main aim of the CPSU's international strategy is extremely clear -- to give the Soviet people the opportunity to work in conditions of lasting peace and freedom. Socialism unreservedly rejects war as a means of resolving interstate contradictions and ideological disputes. The atmosphere of nuclear confrontation imposes the need for new approaches, forms, and methods of mutual relations between different social systems, states, and regions. That approach is adopted -- as the whole world can see -- by the CPSU. "In the future," the 27th party congress resolution on the CPSU Central Committee Political Report notes, "the main avenue of the party's activity in the international arena must continue to be the struggle against the nuclear danger and the arms race and for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace."

You cannot save and preserve peace unless you break -- resolutely and beyond recall -- with a way of thinking and acting which was built over the centuries on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts. What does this require?

Above all, it must be realized that not only nuclear war itself, but preparations for it -- that is, the arms race and the desire for military superiority -- objectively cannot bring anyone a political gain. Confrontation between capitalism and socialism can only flow in the form of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry.

The large-scale Soviet initiatives set forth in the 15 January statement are designed to play a tremendous practical role in delivering mankind from nuclear weapons this century. The comprehensive peace program put forward by the USSR is in essence an alloy of the philosophy of creating a secure world in the nuclear and space age, and a platform of concrete actions. That means concrete actions, within a strict time frame. The Soviet Union intends to strive persistently for its implementation, regarding this as the central avenue of its foreign policy in the coming years. Soviet military doctrine is also in full accordance with the letter and spirit of the initiatives put forward. Its thrust is purely defensive.

The USSR is in favor of taking weapons of mass destruction out of circulation and limiting military potential to within the bounds of reasonable sufficiency. However, the nature and level of those limits continue to be governed by the positions and actions of the United States and its partners in various blocs. The 27th congress of Lenin's party told the whole world: The Soviet Union does not claim greater security but will not accept lesser security.

It was stressed at the congress that it is extremely necessary, before it is too late, to seek a real solution to guarantee us against the transfer of the arms race to space. The "star wars" program cannot be allowed to be used as a stimulus to further the arms race and a barrier on the path to radical disarmament.

The USSR advocates the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. The fundamentals for such a system, formulated by the congress, are a new contribution to world politics. They incorporate a series of measures in the military, political,

economic, and humanitarian spheres. "Success in the battle against war," M.S. Gorbachev stated, "must be achieved without fail. That success will be a historic victory for all mankind, for every person on earth. The CPSU sees active participation in this battle as the very essence of its foreign policy strategy." The socialist community countries are with us in waging this battle for peace. The world communist movement, the forces of national and social liberation, and the mighty antiwar movement defend the peoples' security.

The party's course of preserving peace and delivering the world from the nuclear threat, a course so vividly demonstrated by the 27th CPSU Congress, is fully approved and unanimously supported by our country's working people and the servicemen of the Armed Forces. Soviet servicemen see it as their duty to further increase the defense capability of the beloved motherland, and the combat might of the Army and Navy, to achieve new successes in combat and political training, and to strengthen military discipline.

In a single formation with the fraternal armies of the other Warsaw Pact states, the Soviet Armed Forces watch vigilantly over peace and reliably ensure the security of the peoples of the socialist community countries.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET JOURNAL SURVEYS WORLD EVENTS JUNE-SEPTEMBER 1985

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 90-109

[International roundup by B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, V. Rasnitsyn, N. Streltsova: "Current Problems of World Politics"]

[Excerpts] The past summer the peoples of our planet commemorated a memorable date--the 40th anniversary of the smashing of militarist Japan and the end of WWII. The defeat of Hitler Germany's ally, which followed just a few months after its surrender, was possible thanks to the entry into the war of the Soviet Union, which made a decisive contribution to the rout of the Kwantung Army.

The victory over militarist Japan led to a further weakening of the forces of world imperialism. It created favorable conditions for the upsurge of the national liberation movement in countries of the Far East and Southeast Asia, which culminated in socialist revolutions in Vietnam, Korea and China.

In August mankind commemorated another date also--the 40th anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were the victims of atomic bombing. The barbaric act of the American military, which was not dictated by any military necessity, proclaimed to the world that across the Atlantic people had embarked on the preparation of a new war, even more devastating in its consequences. The purpose of this act was obvious from the very outset: to intimidate the USSR and, employing a policy of nuclear blackmail, impose on the postwar world a Pax Americana. Such calculations were not to be--the United States' nuclear monopoly did not last long. But Washington strategists were successful in one thing: the nuclear arms race which they unleashed has brought mankind to a dangerous boundary.

The growing threat of nuclear catastrophe demands persistent and decisive actions to overcome it. The Soviet state's entire activity in the international arena is subordinated to tackling this historic task. Naturally, in the disturbing situation which has been created priority significance is attached to the problem of an improvement in Soviet-American relations: the USSR and the United States have a special responsibility for the fate of peace. "The main question which we must answer," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, declared in his responses to the American TIME Magazine, "is whether we are at last ready to recognize that there is no

other way than to live with one another in the world and whether we are prepared to switch our mentality and mode of action from a warlike to a peaceful track. ...As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we answer this question in the affirmative." War will not come from the Soviet Union, we will never start it, the Soviet leader emphasized. Our people have far-reaching creative plans, and to realize them they need peace.

2. In the Pivotal Direction of the Struggle for Peace

While putting forward complex and critical tasks of an acceleration of Soviet society's socioeconomic development the CPSU is conducting a constant struggle to secure the necessary external conditions for reaching the charted frontiers. This is tackling a problem of a truly worldwide nature. For there is now for no people a more essential, more important question than ensuring the primary right of each person--the right to life--as declared from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress. And today, on the threshold of the next congress, Soviet communists may say with pride: the credit for the fact that for 40 years mankind has succeeded in avoiding world wars belongs to the Communist Party and the Soviet state and the USSR's active peace-loving policy in the international arena.

The USSR embodies its firm will to peace in precise and constructive proposals and deeds. In the last 4½ years alone our country has presented more than 80 initiatives on key problems of world politics, and, were it not for the West's refusal to heed the command of wisdom, the world would today be truly peaceful. The Soviet Union's activity in the international arena in the past months also was subordinated to bringing nearer this noble goal.

Guided by a sense of responsibility for the fate of peace, our country has not slackened efforts aimed at the solution of the set of problems on the agenda of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva: a halt to the arms race on earth and the prevention thereof in space, a limitation of and reduction in nuclear arsenals and a strengthening of strategic stability.

The Soviet Union came to the negotiations with the firm intention of seeking fair and honest accords on the entire range of problems to be discussed. As is known, in order to facilitate their achievement the USSR announced the unilateral imposition as of 7 April of a moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and halted the implementation of other retaliatory measures caused by the deployment in Europe of the new American missiles. The proposal put forward by the Soviet Union in connection with the start of the second round of negotiations concerning the establishment for the whole time of the negotiations of a moratorium on the creation, research into, testing and deployment of strike space weapons and also on a freeze of strategic offensive arms was also dictated by an endeavor to create a favorable atmosphere in Geneva. Furthermore, the USSR presented the initiative that upon the establishment of a moratorium the two sides agree to submit at the negotiations within a certain time, 1-2 months, say, their specific proposals on all the questions under discussion, including the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce strategic offensive arms, on condition, of course, of a ban on strike space arms.

Thus in the course of the two rounds of the Geneva negotiations (the second ended in July) our country demonstrated a truly constructive approach to a solution of the most important present-day problem and a sincere interest in the achievement of mutually acceptable accords.

Unfortunately, this cannot be said of the other side--the United States--whose position is blocking progress in Geneva. Having adopted a policy of achieving military superiority over the USSR, the United States, as again shown by the second round of negotiations, is in fact using them as a smokescreen for the acceleration of gigantic militarist programs, including the "star wars" program.

It is cramped for the aggressive designs of American imperialism within the framework of existing accords. This was demonstrated graphically, in particular, this June, when, coming very close to the level of nuclear strategic arms stipulated by the SALT II Treaty, Washington was ready to cast aside the provisions of this important agreement. True, considering the mood which exists both in the United States itself and among America's allies and in the world as a whole, the administration deemed an outright renunciation of its treaty commitments a risky business. In his statement on 10 June the head of the White House promised to abide by the terms of the treaty. But he simultaneously made it understood that the United States might revise its decision in the future. In fact Washington has long been pursuing a policy of undermining the Soviet-American SALT II Treaty.

The question arises: on what does Washington intend reaching agreement in Geneva if even the limitations which exist currently are unacceptable to it?

The present U.S. Administration is the sole administration in many years which is declining in practice any agreements with the Soviet Union aimed at reducing the threat of war and improving the international atmosphere. The latest testimony to this was Washington's attitude toward the exceptionally important initiative of the USSR presented at the end of July. On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the barbaric crime of the American military against mankind--the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki--M.S. Gorbachev announced our country's decision to suspend unilaterally as of 6 August all nuclear explosions. The moratorium is in effect until 1 January 1986, but it could be extended if the United States, for its part, also refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union called on the U.S. Government to join in the moratorium. Presenting the new foreign policy initiative aimed at removing the threat of nuclear war and strengthening peace, the USSR was guided by an endeavor to break the vicious circle of the arms race. After all, new kinds and types of weapons of mass annihilation are developed in the course of testing. In other words, a halt to testing is a realistic path toward the elimination of nuclear arsenals inasmuch as if the modernization of the existing nuclear weapons systems is impossible, they will gradually lose their effectiveness and will ultimately wither away.

Such a prospect corresponds to the cherished aspirations of all peoples, to which the broad support for the new Soviet initiative by the world community

testifies. Millions of people on all continents have evaluated the USSR's decision to impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as the latest manifestation of our country's sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind. Official Washington had a different response. Without daring to reject the Soviet initiative outright and thereby demonstrate for the umpteenth time to the whole world its reluctance to tackle in practice problems of limiting and halting the arms race, the United States began to invent various dodges to rid itself of the USSR's appeal for its example to be followed. Initially, as repeatedly in the past, Washington hastened to declare the Soviet proposal "propaganda," then it came out with its own "initiative," proposing that the USSR send its observers to the next American tests, which were timed, incidentally, to coincide with the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedy (this can be called nothing other than the height of cynicism!). Then under the pressure of world, including American, public opinion President Reagan was finally forced to set forth the United States' position on the question of a halt to nuclear explosions. However, instead of a clear and, as all peace-loving people hoped, positive reply to the Soviet proposal to join in the moratorium, he in fact rejected it, declaring that there could be no question of any moratorium on the part of the United States until it had fully completed its testing program. According to an American press report citing military experts, the Pentagon needs these tests, in particular, to create the new Midgetman first-strike missile and implement the "strategic defense initiative".

The plans being hatched in Washington for the militarization of space and the actual steps being taken in this direction have confronted mankind with the choice: either space will produce increasingly tangible fruit for an improvement in the living conditions of inhabitants of the planet or it will become a source of mortal danger. The question is one of immediacy. The United States is already performing practical work on the creation of strike space weapons. In September the Pentagon plans to test an antisatellite weapon, which specialists regard as the transition to practical realization of the program for the militarization of space. If this process is not stopped, the arms race will assume even greater dimensions and intensity in all areas.

Proceeding from the seriousness and urgency of this problem, the Soviet Union proposed that the agenda of the UN General Assembly 40th Session include the question "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Conquest of Space Under the Conditions of its Nonmilitarization". The USSR's proposal provides, *inter alia*, for the implementation of a set of measures which would contribute to the unification of various states' efforts in the peaceful exploration of space and the use of space technology for the good of all mankind, including all around assistance in this sphere to the developing countries. For coordination of the basic directions of cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space the USSR proposes the convening of a governmental international conference with the participation of states possessing major space potential. Such a conference would also examine the question of the creation of a world space organization for international cooperation in this sphere. "The Soviet Union is convinced

that space--the common property of mankind--should be put not at the service of war but at the service of peace and security and the economic and social progress of all peoples," the Soviet proposal emphasized. And this position corresponds fully to the USSR's approach to the problem of preventing an arms race in space, a halt thereof on Earth and the removal of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe.

3. Europe--Confrontation or Detente?

The return of international relations to the channel of detente insistently demands that detente be underpinned by political measures aimed at reducing the threat of conflict on the continent. Implementation of the proposals submitted by the socialist countries at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe for the conclusion by the participants in the All-European Conference of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace could contribute to this to a large extent. The pivotal provision of such a treaty would be an undertaking not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms, consequently, to use military force in general. Summing up the work of the latest session of the conference, which ended in July, it may be noted that, despite the obstructionist actions of the U.S. delegation, the socialist states' proposal was the leading topic of discussion at the Stockholm forum. Besides the socialist states, the neutral and nonaligned states and also Greece, Spain, Italy and France support the adoption of an international commitment on the mutual nonuse of force.

The working documents presented by the socialist countries at the conference on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe and notification of large-scale army, navy and air force exercises and also large-scale troop movements and transfers imparted a new direction to the discussion of military confidence-building measures. It is no secret that the holding of exercises and maneuvers with the participation of large-scale forces could bring about a growth of tension and create a threat to peoples' security. Sometimes, as can be seen from the example of certain NATO maneuvers, they assume such significant proportions that it is difficult to distinguish them from the deployment of troops for the start of combat operations.

The measures proposed by the USSR and its allies are aimed at removing the factors capable of giving rise to suspicion and tension. The socialist countries' proposals are largely consonant with the positions of the neutral and nonaligned

states, the majority of which advocates a limitation of the dimensions of military exercises and that confidence-building measures extend to the activity of such strike forces as the air force and the navy. But it is this which the NATO countries would like to avoid.

They are also occupying just as unconstructive a position in respect of the socialist states' proposals concerning the freeing of European territory from chemical weapons. And this position is easily explained: the United States is speeding up a program of the production of chemical weapons, including their most dangerous variety--binary. In June Congress approved the requisite appropriations. Furthermore, as if sneering at world public opinion, the decision to produce binary weapons was adopted precisely at a time when in Geneva negotiations are continuing on the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. As can be seen, the Pentagon would like to convert Europe into a theater not only of nuclear but also chemical warfare.

The question of a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe being discussed at the Vienna talks is directly related to ensuring European security. Unfortunately, the last, 36th, round of talks brought no progress. Two fundamentally different approaches clash in Vienna, as before. Proceeding from the approximate equivalence of the military groupings which has actually evolved in the center of Europe, the socialist countries proposed a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments on an equal numerical or equal percentage basis. This proposal affords a real opportunity for the achievement of an accord. The success of the talks in Vienna will depend on whether the NATO countries finally make a really constructive response instead of conducting an endless "numerical" discussion.

The dependable pathway toward the strengthening of security in Europe, the Soviet Union believes, is the continent's complete liberation from nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical. The socialist countries are prepared to examine any proposal most seriously--within the framework of the negotiations or outside of them--if it really pursues the aim of strengthening security on the continent. Thus, for example, the socialist countries adopted an understanding attitude toward Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme's proposal concerning the creation in the center of Europe of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons.

True to the spirit of Helsinki, the USSR and its allies seek the elimination of political-psychological factors of the military threat, which is impossible without a deepening of mutual understanding and respect for one another's values and views. Yet many propaganda actions of the Western mass media, as, equally, the speeches of official representatives of the capitalist states, are manifestly sustained in a spirit of "psychological warfare". It is sufficient to mention the subject of the "violation" of human rights in the socialist countries which is constantly being blown up in the West.

4. The Economy and Policy in the Capitalist World

The socioeconomic problems and currency-finance disorders of the EEC are being intensified by political contradictions, which are proving just as difficult to solve. Indicative in this plane was the European Council session held at the end of June in Milan at Common Market member head of state and government level.

The sole asset of the Milan meeting was, perhaps, its participants' approval of the Eureka project, which provides for the West European countries' cooperation in the sphere of advanced technology. The idea of the creation of a "technological Europe," that is, unification of the West Europeans' scientific potential and resources in order to prevent a technology lag behind the United States and Japan and a brain drain across the Atlantic, which had been put forward by Paris in April and which originally did not win the partners' support, thereby began to blaze a trail for itself. It was decided to continue discussion of various aspects of realization of the project at a special conference of ministers of foreign affairs and scientific research.

Such a conference was held in Paris in mid-July. Representatives of 17 West European states (the 10 Common Market countries and also Spain, Portugal, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland and Finland) and EC representatives took part. The conference confirmed the need for creation of a "European technology community" and determined the basic directions of scientific research (supercomputers, microelectronics, artificial intelligence, lasers, biotechnology, optics and so forth). However, its participants were unable to agree on the organizational structure of the European agency for coordinating scientific research ("Eureka" for short. Whence the name of the entire project) and methods of mobilizing the necessary resources. Only the principle of mixed--private and public--financing of the program incorporated in Eureka was determined. Paris has already announced the allocation of Fr1 billion for realization of the project, however, other countries are not rushing to allocate resources as yet.

It also remains unclear who will undertake the coordination of the scientific research. The French proposals concerning organization of the project per a type of international consortium presuppose that the main role therein will be performed not by government bodies but big private companies possessing the necessary capital and scientific base.

Despite the assurances of the initiators of Eureka concerning the "purely civilian nature" of the project, the Paris conference failed to dispel the suspicions concerning the possibility of the use of the results of research for military purposes. In particular, one program within the project's framework provides for the creation of a space station, rocket and Shuttle-

type craft. Observers are calling attention in this connection to the statements of the representatives of a number of countries that Eureka is not aimed against the SDI and that individual companies of West European states may participate in realization of the American program. This applies primarily to the FRG, whose government is increasingly disposed toward such participation by West German companies.

For its part, Washington is continuing the pressure on the West Europeans, demanding that they define their attitude toward the "star wars" program as quickly as possible. This was the purpose pursued, *inter alia*, by the tour of a number of West European countries by Lt Gen J. Abrahamson, leader of the SDI organization, who sought the partners' consent to participate in the plans for the militarization of space.

Another target of pressure on the part of the United States is Japan. Washington does not conceal the fact that it would like to take advantage of this country's big achievements in the sphere of the latest technology for military purposes. The same Abrahamson cited in a television interview the spheres in which the United States aspires to "cooperation" with Japan: computer equipment with hardware and software, electronic-optical equipment and also the corresponding technology and laser equipment. Within the framework of the agreement on cooperation in the sphere of military technology concluded in November 1983 the Pentagon has already requested the transfer to it of the latest military technological developments. In spite of Tokyo's official statements, interaction between the two countries in realization of the "star wars" program is thereby beginning to acquire specific outlines.

And it is not confined to plans for the militarization of space. Washington was visited in June by K. Kato, chief of Japan's National Defense Agency, who held talks there with the U.S. defense secretary. In the course of the consultations C. Weinberger put the question thus: Japan should in the 1980's even carry out military commitments concerning "protection" of sea routes in a radius of up to 1,000 miles from Japan's shores.

The Japanese public, and not only it, regards the expansion of Japanese-American military cooperation as a direct path toward transformation of the "Security Treaty" between the two countries into an aggressive military alliance and Japan's conversion into a coparticipant in American adventures.

Stormy debate developed in Japan this past summer in connection with the government's intention to abandon under Washington's pressure the practice of holding the country's military spending within 1 percent of GNP, although even now its military budget occupies eighth place in the world. Such an intention was communicated by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone in connection with the compilation of the latest 5-year program for Japan's armed forces for 1986-1990. Bellicose circles of Washington and Tokyo are undermining the 1-percent barrier for the sake of Japan's "Self-Defense Force" assuming in the coming 5-year period functions of the U.S. 7th Fleet in the Northwest Pacific.

5. The Peoples Reject Imperialist Diktat

The problems of Asian security as a whole are still on the agenda of international meetings and conferences. Thus the enlarged session of the Presidential Committee of the Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia and Africa held in Ho Chi Minh City attracted the great attention of the international community. The session discussed topical problems of Afro-Asian solidarity, the situation in different parts of Asia and the tasks confronting the public for strengthening national independence, peace and security.

It should be noted that representatives of the public of Australia and New Zealand took part in the committee session for the first time. While not Asian states, they nonetheless display great interest in the strengthening of security in the vast Pacific region. The decisions of the 16th session of the South Pacific Forum held in Avarua--the administrative center of the Cook Islands--testify to this. The 13 states which participated, including Australia and New Zealand, supported declaration of the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone.

A document adopted at the session solemnly proclaimed renunciation of the development, use and testing of any nuclear explosive devices. Furthermore, the countries of the forum officially banned the acquisition and importation onto their territory of nuclear weapons and also the discharge and dumping of radioactive waste in this region.

Naturally, the decisions of the forum in Avarua gave rise to the discontent of the United States and a number of its NATO allies. After all, they run manifestly counter to the Pentagon's militarist plans in respect of the Asia-Pacific region, which is being assigned an increasingly important role in U.S. global strategy.

Mankind is experiencing an alarming, critical time: the arms race is increasing, and the military threat is not abating.

The continuing deterioration in Soviet-American relations and the campaign being mounted across the Atlantic of hostility and hatred toward our country cannot fail to give rise to concern also.

M.S. Gorbachev pointed to the impermissibility, danger and senselessness of such an approach by the United States to relations with the Soviet Union in replies to the American TIME Magazine. He emphasized that all attempts to bring the Soviet Union to its knees and wear it out are doomed to fail.

The language of force, even more, the "from a position of strength" policy in the nuclear and space age entails the threat of the annihilation of everything living on Earth. The Soviet leadership is fully aware of its responsibility for the fate of peace and calls on Washington to display the same sense of responsibility in the present explosive situation.

"All people want to live, nobody wants to die," the CPSU Central Committee general secretary declared. "For this reason it is necessary to summon up the political courage and halt the unfolding menacing process. It is necessary to halt the arms race and embark on disarmament and an improvement in relations."

Such is our country's clear and honest approach, to the forthcoming November meeting of the Soviet and American leaders in Geneva included. The danger looming over the peoples may be averted--it is to this that the USSR's specific proposals are geared, be it a question of the nonmilitarization of space, the banning of all nuclear tests, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate-range, or a political settlement of conflict situations in "flash points".

This position is humanitarian and nonegoistic and corresponds fully to the interests of both the USSR and the United States and all other peoples.

It is significant that the Soviet foreign policy initiatives are enjoying the most widespread positive comments in the international community. Prominent politicians and public figures and a multitude of various organizations all over the world, in the United States included, warmly supported the Soviet Union's decision to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions. This decision was greeted enthusiastically by the participants in the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow.

The delegates to the UN General Assembly anniversary 40th Session in New York evaluate highly the new USSR proposal concerning the basic directions and principles of international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization.

These and many other specific steps of the Soviet Union aimed at an improvement in the international situation are profoundly consonant with the demands of the world antiwar, antinuclear movement--the world's broadest public movement. The events of recent months have confirmed once again the soundness of the Soviet viewpoint that a difference in world view or political differences should not serve as an impediment to joint action for the purpose of solving the main global problem--preventing a general nuclear catastrophe.

The broad international support of our country's efforts to preserve peace on Earth instills optimism and faith in the victory of common sense and good will. In the name of this goal the Soviet people will continue to spare no forces, striving for a further upsurge of the socialist economy and putting forward increasingly new peace initiatives. And our reserves of constructiveness are vast.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya." 1985

8850/8309

CSO: 1816/2

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA PUBLISHES WARSAW PACT FOREIGN MINISTERS COMMUNIQUE

PH201715 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

["Communique of a Session of the Warsaw Pact States Foreign Ministers Committee--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpt]

A routine session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was held in Warsaw 19-20 March 1986.

Taking part in the meeting were Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic Peter Varkonyi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic Gnar Fischer, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic Marian Orzechowski, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania Ilie Vaduva, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Eduard Shevardnadze, and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Bohuslav Chnoupek.

1. The ministers exchanged opinions on the situation in Europe in light of the general state of international relations and the prospects for their future development. They placed on record the fact that the international situation remains tense and dangerous. Concern was expressed over the intensification of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and the actions being taken to extend it into space. The United States and its NATO allies are pressing ahead with the arms race in all directions. The unceasing deployment of American medium-range missiles in a number of West European countries causes serious alarm. The imperialist policy of force and of interference in other states' internal affairs continues. All this increases the danger of worldwide nuclear catastrophe, threatening the destruction of life on earth.

At the same time a real hope of changes for the better in the international arena has appeared thanks to the vigorous and purposeful actions of socialist states, and the faith of people in a peaceful future has been strengthened.

The ministers stressed that the peace proposals, set forth by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty member-countries in Sofia in October 1985, are directed at carrying out the most urgent, cardinal task of our time -- to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, to stop the arms race, first of all the nuclear arms race, and to switch over to disarmament. The consistent, peace-loving policy of the Warsaw Treaty member-states opens up real possibilities for the attainment of these

aims, for a constructive dialogue on the most pressing and burning problems of international relations.

The Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva created preconditions for a transition from the present state of confrontation to a normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States and for improving the international situation.

By the joint vigorous and persistent actions of governments and peoples, of all realistically thinking forces, it is possible to ensure a turn for the better in European and world affairs, a revival of the policy of detente and constructive cooperation.

The states represented at the meeting fully supported the program of fully liquidating all arsenals of nuclear and chemical arms before the end of this century and banning space strike arms set forth in the 15 January 1986 statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Stressing the very great importance of this program, they are determined to make every effort to carry it out. This would remove the threat hanging over mankind, lead to a radical improvement of the international situation, and provide an opportunity for doing away with weapons of mass destruction for good.

The Warsaw Treaty states insistently urge the NATO countries, above all the United States, Britain, and France, to display realism and responsibility with a view to reaching accords, taking into account the interests of both sides and all other states, concerning a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and their subsequent elimination and prevention of an arms race in space.

Elimination of weapons of mass destruction should be accompanied with an appropriate reduction of conventional arms and armed forces. The states represented at the meeting reaffirmed their principled position and proposals on matters of disarmament, stronger peace, and international security. They come out for strict observance of the principle of equality and identical security and for ensuring military balance at a lower level.

It was stressed that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting should center on questions connected with reaching concrete agreements on stopping the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, on earth and preventing it in space. At this meeting accords could be reached at least on questions of ending nuclear tests and eliminating American and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone.

It was stressed at the meeting that it is necessary for all states to strictly observe the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty, nonuse of force or threat of force, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, a peaceful settlement of disputes, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and other generally recognized norms of international relations.

2. The Warsaw Treaty states are most resolutely against the further stockpiling of nuclear weapons in Europe, and for completely freeing the continent of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. They stand for complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise missiles -- in the European zone as the first step in this direction.

Implementation of such a measure requires that the United States make a commitment not to supply its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries while

Britain and France make a pledge not to increase their corresponding nuclear armaments. Once American medium-range missiles are completely eliminated in Europe, there will be no need for the further presence of Soviet operational-tactical missiles of enhanced range in the countries where they were installed.

Participants in the meeting believe that the establishment of nuclear-free zones in different regions of the continent would be a good step on the way to delivering Europe from nuclear weapons. They support the proposals for establishing such zones in Scandinavia and the Balkans as well as proposals for creating a nuclear-free corridor along the line dividing the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in central Europe.

The states represented at the meeting want the European Continent to be fully cleared of chemical weapons. In this connection they support the proposals of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania for establishing zones free of chemical weapons accordingly in central Europe and the Balkans.

The ministers consider it necessary to invigorate the Vienna talks on mutual armed forces and arms cuts in central Europe to most speedily reach mutually acceptable agreements. The proposals presented on 20 February 1986 by the allied socialist states -- direct participants in the talks -- contribute to drawing the sides' stands closer. Hope was expressed that these proposals will meet with a positive response.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states call for steadily carrying on the all-European process, and for strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe.

The ministers have discussed the state of affairs at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and consider it necessary to accelerate its work in order to complete the first stage by the adoption of a substantial final document, that would be tabled at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The ministers expect the forthcoming meeting in Berne of experts of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe dealing with questions of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations to be held in a constructive atmosphere. It was pointed out that the socialist states will further consistently work for fully ensuring, given the respect for the sovereignty of states, human rights in all fields, especially, the right to life in conditions of peace and freedom.

An exchange of views and information has been held on the course of preparations for the scheduled meeting of representatives of states -- participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which is to open in Vienna this autumn. That meeting is designed to make a substantial contribution to improving the political climate and reviving detente in Europe and in the world, in coordinating major new steps for lowering the level of military confrontation on the European Continent, and broadening cooperation between European states. The need for developing economic and scientific-technological cooperation and building up confidence in economic relations was stressed.

The opening of the Vienna meeting at the foreign ministers level would give it the necessary political impetus.

The ministers have examined in detail questions pertaining to strengthening peace and security and the development of cooperation on the European Continent, and

have resolutely declared that the inviolability of borders, respect for territorial-political realities, which were shaped as a result of World War II, and post-war developments are the necessary prerequisites for preserving peace and security in Europe. They have condemned the dangerous activity of the revanchist forces, above all in the FRG, and stressed that revanchism and support for it anywhere poison the political atmosphere and are detrimental to mutual understanding among the European nations, thus threatening the outbreak of a military conflict.

3. The ministers have stressed the importance of accelerating work at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons for a practical response to the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth, and achieving weighty results in the interests of all peoples. They support the Soviet Union's constructive stand at the talks directed at this.

The meeting reaffirmed the need to prevent the spread of the arms race into outer space and to limit the use of outer space solely for peaceful aims for the benefit of all mankind. Preserving a peaceful outer space is the necessary prerequisite for carrying out far-reaching cuts and eliminating nuclear weapons.

Note was taken of the serious responsibility assumed by the initiators of the program for the emplacement of weapons in space and those who join in carrying it out, and also of the danger which the implementation of projects, similar to the so-called "European Defense Initiative," advanced in some Western European countries, would entail.

Noting the urgent need to end nuclear testing as an important measure to improve the international atmosphere and a major step along the road toward eliminating nuclear weapons, the Warsaw Treaty member-states call on the United States to terminate any nuclear explosions the way the Soviet Union did. The participants in the meeting welcome the statement of the USSR in which it said it would not conduct nuclear explosions after its unilateral moratorium expired on 31 March 1986 -- until the United States carries out its first nuclear explosion.

Everything should be done to reach agreement on the termination of all nuclear explosions. They came out in favor of an undelayed beginning of bilateral Soviet-American, or the resumption of tripartite -- involving Britain -- talks, on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and in favor of holding multilateral talks on that problem within the framework of the Geneva conference on disarmament. Agreement was expressed with the proposal of the nonaligned countries on holding consultations with a view to making the 1962 Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water apply also to underground tests, which are not covered by the treaty.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states believe the task of the complete elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture as early as in this century to be quite feasible. Talks on the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons should be intensified. They stand for reaching accord on a multilateral basis on the non-transfer of chemical weapons to anyone whatsoever and on their non-emplacement on the territory of other states. The states represented at the meeting, themselves adhering to this, call on the NATO countries to display similar restraint.

They came out in favor of a ban on the creation of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles which, in terms of their casualty-producing capabilities, are approximate to means of mass destruction.

The states represented at the meeting confirm their stance in favor of not increasing and in favor of reducing the military expenditures of states, and above all those possessing a major military potential.

They proceed from the need for efficacious, effective monitoring [kontrol] in all spheres of the limitation and reduction of arms and disarmament -- the kind of monitoring which must accord with the volume and nature of pledges made by the sides.

The meeting's participants advocate that each arms limitation and disarmament measure should not only bring greater security but must also make it possible to allocate more money for the improvement of people's conditions of life, and for the elimination of their military organizations. The Warsaw Pact member-states as before, are prepared to enter into negotiations with the NATO member-states to reach an appropriate agreement, starting with the question of the mutual reduction of military activity.

They renew their proposal that a treaty be concluded on mutual non-use of military force and maintaining relations of peace, that would be open also to a European and other countries concerned.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

11 April 1986

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S 'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION--QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS' 14 MAR

LD142353 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Mar 86

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program, introduced by Konstantin Patsyuk, All-Union Radio commentator; with Spartak Beglov, APN political observer; Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist; Nikolay Agayants, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; and Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military affairs]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Soviet people followed the proceedings of the 27th CPSU Congress with great interest. Meeting at a turning point in our country's history, the congress approved the concept of the acceleration of the USSR's social and economic development and reaffirmed the Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction on earth by the end of this century. Numerous letters, which we are currently receiving, express support for our party's domestic and foreign policies and satisfaction with the results of the congress' work. Our listeners Tamara Petrovna Barinova; the Gribanovs, husband and wife, from Moscow; Oleg Borisovich Dmitriyev from Rostov na Donu; and many others ask us to describe the impact made by the 27th CPSU Congress in the world. To accommodate their wishes, we have asked Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, APN political observer, to appear on our program. Spartak Ivanovich, how can one describe the overall world reaction to the proceedings and decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress?

[Beglov] Let me start by saying that even before the 27th CPSU Congress ended, the following thought emerged in the assessments of a whole number of international observers, including the foreign correspondents I met at the Moscow Press Center: There has perhaps not been in recent times a party congress like it in any country, attracting as it did by its content and its decisions such rapt and interested attention from the whole world. And it is clear why. It is not just because of the fact that it marks a watershed in the life of our people, who have set a course for qualitatively new reference points in the perfection of their society and the acceleration of its progress, but also because the foreign policy strategy worked out by the congress is notable for its high degree of realism; it reflects as fully as possible the conditions in which humanity exists, and sets tasks dictated by an age of great social revolutions and scientific-technical progress.

[Patsyuk] Our country's efforts on the international scene are focused on certain principal points, principal areas. What is the foundation, what is the nucleus, so to speak, of the congress' foreign policy platform?

[Beglov] The congress set out a clear, precise and well-constructed concept of peace and security in the nuclear age. Here are its main ideas. The world has become too

small and fragile for wars and the policy of force. The combination of competition and historical confrontation between the two systems with the growing tendency toward an objective interdependence of the world community is the real dialectic of contemporary world development. The course of history demands with increasing insistence that close cooperation be established between states and peoples on a worldwide scale with a view to mastering the science and art of living in a state of proper international intercourse and cooperation. There can be no winners in either a nuclear war or in the arms race. The maintenance of security in the interests of the survival of mankind is a political task which must be carried out by political means. To implement this approach, the idea of creating an all-embracing system of international security was advanced at the congress. For the first time, international security is presented in terms of all its dimensions: military, political, economic, and humanitarian.

[Patsyuk] And how does the policy of the United States and NATO appear in the face of the Soviet concept of peace formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress?

[Beglov] The program which the Soviet Union has put forth for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the start of the 3d millenium was defined in the report of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee as the central thrust of the Soviet state's foreign political activities in the forthcoming years. The advancement of such a vitally important task has turned into a test of the willingness and sincerity of every government to joint actively in the cause of disarmament. Unfortunately, Washington's first official reaction to the Soviet proposals amounted to a whole cascade of assorted U.S. conditions and reservations standing in the path of specific practical steps toward nuclear disarmament. It is legitimate to ask whether the U.S. leadership has in practice managed to adapt its psychology and its approach to world affairs. Regrettably, we can observe once again a growing lacuna in the West between words and actions.

Remember the words to which the U.S. President put his signature at the Soviet-U.S. summit last November: They stated the impossibility and inadmissibility of chasing after military superiority, and the priority of nuclear disarmament. The day after the opening of the congress in Moscow, the U.S. President found nothing better than to declare again that force is the most convincing argument that we have. Is this not a return to the old way of thinking, to the illusion that the more weapons there are, the more reliable security is, an illusion that has outlived its time? The politicians of the NATO countries have been bluntly faced with the question of whether they are at all prepared to give up nuclear weapons. The statements which are currently emanating from Washington, London and the other NATO capitals show that the leaders of these countries seem to have become so accustomed to nuclear weapons that in the face of the urgent steps on the path to a world without nuclear weapons, as proposed by the Soviet Union, they are not averse to repudiating their own assurances of their commitment to nuclear disarmament. But the moment of truth has arrived. In light of the ideas and proposals of the 27th congress, the true value of the policy of each of the partners in disarmament talks is emerging.

[Patsyuk] I am holding a number of letters whose authors condemn the policies of the U.S. Administration and its approach to our proposals. This is stated, in particular, by Comrade Khrushcheva from Novomoskovsk and Vladimir Dmitriyevich Petukhov from Leningrad. Comrade Petukhov says bluntly that it is difficult to believe that they, the imperialists, will opt for disarmament.

[Beglov] We do not close our eyes to the fact that the aggressive forces of imperialism are attempting to perpetuate confrontation and to give a boost to the arms race. But another tendency is irreversible. It is increasingly difficult for Western

politicians to fail to reckon with the mood of the broad masses calling for disarmament. Throughout the world a powerful counterweight to militarist policies is growing: I refer to the enormous potential of world socialism, of the forces of national and social liberation, and of the mass democratic antiwar movements which have recently entered the arena. One must also mention here the still far from fully realized potential for common sense of a certain proportion of the ruling circles of the capitalist world. As is clear from what I have said, the CPSU's approach to problems of foreign policy combines a firm defense of the interests of the Soviet people and resolute opposition to the aggressive policies of imperialism with a willingness for dialogue and constructive tackling of international issues through talks.

The implementation of the party's foreign policy course will demand great work and effort. But we are certain that the future belongs to just such a policy.

[Patsyuk] Comrade Ivanov from the town of Koryazhma in Archangel Oblast asks us to talk about the U.S. space shuttles. We asked Vladimir Ivanovich Bogachev, TASS observer on military questions, to answer this letter.

[Bogachev] To start with, a few words about the technical characteristics of the ship. Its chief peculiarity is that the shuttle is a reusable ship and is intended for 100 flights. After the Challenger catastrophe three ships of this series remain in the United States.

[Patsyuk] And now, what about the purpose of these ships.

[Bogachev] The space shuttle program occupies a large place in U.S. plans for "star wars," and in general nobody hides this. The reusable ships particularly have to fulfill tasks in carrying out reconnaissance and in intercepting the satellites of the other side. During the Challenger flight in 1983, the astronauts carried out corresponding tests, and with the help of a 15-meter long mechanical arm, they removed a U.S. satellite from orbit. It is also planned to use the ships for delivering military satellites and elements of strike space weapons into orbit. The possibilities of the ships as means for destroying space installations and as means for deploying [razmeshcheniye] space mines in near-earth space are being studied. The Pentagon's space caddies [izvozchiki] as the shuttle is called in America, can be adapted for inflicting strikes on especially important strategic targets on earth.

[Patsyuk] That is, in other words, these ships to a great extent will be carrying out military tasks, and with their help the United States is pursuing a quite definite aim. Is that not it, Vladimir Ivanovich?

[Bogachev] Yes, quite right, Konstantin Nikolayevich. One of the shuttle commanders, U.S. Air Force Colonel Jack Lousma, stated straightforwardly: Space is a place from which the whole world can be held in fear.

U.S. observer Jack Anderson noted that with the help of the space shuttle program the United States intends to ensure its strategic superiority. But through an irony of fate, the shuttles which are called on to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the U.S. "star wars" program, have shown just how dangerous the militarization of space is to mankind. I am thinking of the Challenger catastrophe with the astronauts on board.

[Patsyuk] Our country, as we know, proposes a different space program.

[Bogdanov] Yes. From the very beginning of the space era, the Soviet Union has spoken out and continues to speak out for the use of space only for peaceful aims. Our country has put forth a wide-scale program for its peaceful development. There is no room for weapons in space. Near-earth space should not become an arena for the arms race. In contrast to the United States, our country proposes "star peace", not "star wars". The present flight of Soviet cosmonauts will become another contribution to the peaceful development of space. The remarkable achievements of the human mind should serve not the aims of the destruction of the world's civilization, but the aims of its progress.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S 23 MARCH WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD231727 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Mar 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Nikolay Agayants; Spartak Beglov, APN political observer; and Vitaliy Sobolev, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator]

[Excerpt]

[Agayants] Good afternoon, comrades. With snowstorms, winds, unexpected frosts, and snowfalls winter is departing -- very unwillingly, but still it is departing and making way for spring. That's the state of affairs in nature. As for our planet's political climate, unfortunately, a genuine warming-up is still a long way off. This is confirmed by the events of the past week which have reflected like a mirror the two principle trends, the two courses of development of contemporary international relations. On one hand, the course of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states towards curbing the giddy arms race on earth and preventing its extension into space and towards averting nuclear war and achieving detente; on the other hand, the adventurist, militaristic, and aggressive course of the United States and its partners in various types of military blocs. Here are just a few of the most vivid examples of this confrontation: The communique of the meeting of the committee of the ministers of foreign affairs of the Warsaw Pact participant states and the documents of the meeting of NATO's nuclear planning group; the Soviet Union's continuing peaceful research of the universe and Washington's striving by hook or by crook to draw its allies even further into its dangerous 'star wars' program; the USSR's proposals on the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts and the Reaganite doctrine of neoglobalism in action.

[Sobolev] I would like to add, Nikolay Ivanovich, that the difference between the two approaches and the two trends is reflected in this week's major internal political events in the socialist and the bourgeois countries. On one hand, there are the large plans for peaceful construction that were discussed at the meetings of the supreme bodies of state power of Bulgaria and Hungary, and at workers' assemblies, for example, in Mongolia where the basic guidelines for social and economic development over the new 5-year-period have been put forward for discussion. They have been discussed in the course of preparations for the fraternal parties' congresses -- the Czechoslovak Communists' forum, for example, begins tomorrow.

On the other hand are the militaristic budgets depriving the poor of what little they have left. At the moment draft state budgets are being discussed in the United States and Great Britain and are being strongly criticized in those countries. In the United States, the Senate Budget Committee has cut the share earmarked for the Pentagon by

\$25 billion, but still what remains is 3 percent more -- and 3 percent is a very considerable amount -- than the United States current military appropriation.

In Britain, the Labor leader Kinnock has called the Conservatives' financial program a present to the rich and even a Conservative MP -- Latham -- has admitted that the draft does not take into account the interests of the poor. I am going into this, perhaps in detail, because the details make it possible for each citizen of a given country and not only diplomats and journalists, to experience for themselves, so to speak, the difference between the two foreign policy courses. The Central Committee's Political Report to the 27th congress states that the CPSU's international strategy is determined by the basic tasks of the country's economic and social development. The principle objective of this strategy is to guarantee the Soviet people the opportunity of working in conditions of stable peace and freedom -- such is the party's primary and key demand of our foreign policy.

[Agayants] The routine meeting of the committee of the ministers of foreign affairs of the Warsaw Pact participant states held in Warsaw on 19 and 20 March, once again affirmed that the international situation continues to remain extremely tense and dangerous.

The ministers expressed serious concern over the fact that the arms race and particularly the nuclear arms race is being stepped up and that Washington is undertaking specific actions to expand it into near-earth orbits. One cannot fail to be alarmed, states the communique adopted in Warsaw, that the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in West Europe is not ceasing and that the imperialist policy of strength and interference in the domestic affairs of other states is continuing. All this, of course, is increasing the danger of a world-wide nuclear disaster threatening the destruction of life on our planet.

The Warsaw Pact participant states have made an urgent appeal to the NATO member countries -- above all to the United States, Great Britain and France -- to display realism and responsibility in the aim of achieving accords taking into account the interests of both sides and all other states on the radical reduction of nuclear weapons and their subsequent elimination and on the prevention of an arms race in space. So, as we can see, the struggle against the nuclear danger, against the unbridled build-up of nuclear weapons and the struggle to preserve and consolidate peace, remain the main thrust of the foreign policy activity of our party and our state. But what about the West? How is it reacting to the Soviet peace initiatives?

Further, it is well known that the 27th CPSU Congress gave, as we say, a start in life to the extremely important idea of creating a comprehensive system of international security. Its main foundations, as formulated in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the congress, are of an all-round, integrated and constructive nature and touch on the military, political, economic, and humanitarian aspects of the modern concept of international security. As has already been noted in numerous comments in the foreign mass information media and in speeches by prominent politicians and public figures in various countries, this is a very important step for achieving an accord on today's cardinal problems.

[Sobolev] At this point, Nikolay Ivanovich, it is evidently worth mentioning once again the very significant clause of the Central Committee's Political Report to our party's congress which talks about the essence of contemporary capitalism. Imperialism is also pushed into translating the competition between the two systems into the language of military confrontation by inner springs -- by its social and economic essence itself.

By virtue of its social nature imperialism constantly generates -- that is, engenders -- an aggressive and adventurist policy. So states the report.

[Agayants] Yes, Vitaliy Sergeyevich. And this is all especially characteristic of U.S. politics where the right wing -- the monopolist bourgeoisie -- sees the whipping-up of international tension as a justification for the growth of military expenditure, global claims, and interference in the domestic affairs of other states.

[Beglov] The thing is that by the development of events Western governments were faced with the question of whether they are willing to part with nuclear weapons and whether they are ready for practical steps which would lead to the creation of firm foundations for international security. And when the leaders of the United States and the other NATO countries were faced with a test of their political will they began to take recourse to, I would say, a sort of hackneyed kind of maneuvering. They started to claim that the Western stance is allegedly a stance of realism, whereas the proposals of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are a propaganda stance. However, in these clever dodges of all kinds, aimed at proving the unprovable, they expose themselves in the sense that they are disavowing their own policies, their own stances, to which at one time they practically, I would say, swore their loyalty before the whole world.

Let us think back to what happened in Geneva after the summit meeting between the USSR and United States leaders when President Reagan was taking his leave of Comrade Gorbachev.

He said that before leaving Geneva he wanted to stress that he was firmly resolved to make use of any opportunity in order to create a safer world. Let us recall what British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher announced from high governmental rostra a year before that when the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Comrade Gorbachev was being received in London, in December 1984. She said that there is no sense in balance at ever higher levels of arms; we are entering into disarmament negotiations fully resolved to make them succeed, we do not want to have heaps of nuclear weapons but want negotiations to be held between the United States and the Soviet Union. At that time everyone was campaigning for the rapid elimination of both American and Soviet medium range missiles in Europe and everyone swore loyalty to the cause of radically reducing nuclear weapons.

But what is happening now in light of what has been said in Washington over the past few weeks in connection with the Soviet proposal on ending nuclear tests, the Soviet Union's extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, and in connection with the appeal from the participants of the Delhi Six to the two powers not to sanction any new nuclear tests before the summit meeting? Statements of a totally different kind are now emanating from Washington, saying that we will evidently have to get used to nuclear weapons for a long time to come and that nuclear tests must continue because as long as nuclear weapons exist they have to be improved.

[Agayants] Within the course of this dangerous policy of Washington's which is giving rise to just indignation on the part of all people of good will on our planet no matter where they live and no matter the views to which they adhere, within the course of this policy there is the new explosion of a nuclear device under the code-name "Glencoe" at the proving ground in Nevada and there are the preparations which are taking place at full speed for the testing of an x-ray laser triggered by a nuclear explosion which is scheduled to take place in April. All these are links in a single chain and they are evidence of the fact that the U.S. Administration, in response to the good-will

steps taken by the Soviet Union, is making a point of ignoring all calls for a halt to nuclear tests and for the achievement of most important accords in this field.

[Beglov] And so if one has to say what really are the positions now clashing with each other, I would put it this way: One position is that of reason and realism and this is reflected in the Soviet proposals; and there is also the position based on tricks, provisos and conditions in which one can clearly see an unwillingness on the part of the Western powers to part with nuclear weapons and reduce the level of military confrontation both in Europe and globally.

[Agayants] That is all quite right, Spartak Ivanovich and it seems to me that one circumstance of no mean importance in the implementation of such a hard line by Washington -- judging by latest events -- is also the calculation the United States is making upon being able to use the tension that exists in the world to put pressure upon its allies in order to make them as obedient and unlikely to give trouble as possible. This is also confirmed by the visit to London and Bonn of Caspar Weinberger, the Pentagon boss and it is confirmed in full measure by the results of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, which has ended its work in the West German town of Wuerzburg.

[Beglov] Yes, both in Wuerzburg and generally as far as Weinberger's arrival in West Europe is concerned, I would say that a kind of open trading has taken place around the question of what the British leadership is going to get in return for its support of SDI and what the FRG is going to get for the fact that it, too, is going to become involved in the implementation of this program. And overall the deal took place in this sense: That the U.S. secretary of defense essentially gave a pledge that the United States will support in every way this inflexible position on the part of Great Britain on the need to build up British arsenals and on the fact that this issue has blocked the first stage proposed by the Soviet Union for nuclear disarmament, namely the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium range missiles in Europe.

Furthermore some things about this deal simply hit one in their shamelessness. For example, some figures in the FRG had this to say: We want very much to get involved in the Strategic Defense Initiative program and we will try to convince our public that we will gain in the technological sense and will get access to U.S. technology, but at the same time we will try to distance ourselves from the military aspects of this project.

[Agayants] In this connection, Spartak Ivanovich, I would like to make the following observation: Today space is the most advanced frontier of mankind, whose fate depends to a large extent upon the routes that are going to be taken by the further mastery of space around the earth and the purposes for which it is going to be used: Peaceful ones, which are capable of giving people colossal economic and scientific and technical advantages; or military ones, which will lead to an intensification of the arms race and the growth of the threat of nuclear war. Our position, the position of the Soviet Union, is of the utmost clarity, consistent and unambiguous: We are in favor of wide cooperation in the name of peace and in the name of clear skies over our planet. This was confirmed yet again by the work done by Vega automatic stations on the Venus-Halley's comet project and it is being confirmed, too, by the continuing space watch of Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyev on the Mir-Soyuz T-15 manned complex.

[Sobolev] The idea of a "star peace" instead of "star wars" -- put forward by the Soviet Union -- the Soviet proposals on international cooperation in space exploration; and the real cooperation which is still continuing despite Washington's displeasure is attractive to people, including American space specialists. For example, look at

the extent to which they are writing in the United States about the prospects for an international manned flight to Mars: Americans consider -- and I believe they do so with good reason -- that it would indeed be good to carry out this grandiose undertaking jointly. American scientists invited to Moscow to observe the progress of the flight by the space stations to Halley's Comet returned home, according to the American journal US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, struck not just by the technical achievements but by the spirit of international cooperation that pervades the Vega project. The journal noted with satisfaction that the apparatus for analyzing the dust was made available for this project by American scientists. The United States did not send its own station to the comet. They have not thrown all their strength and their resources into the Pentagon's space taxi-cabs, as they call the shuttle-craft in the West. Just listen the tone of what was said, for example, by President Smith of the American Astronautical Society, about Soviet space exploration: They possess phenomenal launch capabilities. While (?Johnson), a space equipment specialist from the (?Teledyne Brown Engineering) Company put it like this: No country has a greater right to take pride in its achievements in space exploration than the Soviet Union. And one ought to add that this is because our country has always wanted to see space as something peaceful, to see it as an arena for cooperation between different countries.

[Agayants] As you know, comrades, in Washington and in some Western Europe capitals they hold a diametrically opposite point of view: There they favor the active militarization of space and strive at any price to achieve implementation of the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative, that is to say the selfsame "star wars." Things are threatening to become irreversible and for that reason the following words were spoken from the platform of our congress in the political report; let me remind you of them: It is essential in the extreme, before it is too late, to seek out real solutions that would guarantee that the arms race will not be carried over into space. One cannot allow the "star wars" program to be used as a stimulus for a further arms race and as an obstacle on the path towards radical disarmament. The Soviet peace proposals, including the latest ones, are aimed directly at solving this important problem in a practical key.

[Beglov] At the same time American, generals and politicians -- like Abrahamson, the leader of the SDI project -- are rubbing their hands and telling their colleagues in Washington that they have in fact obtained agreement to the kind of contribution to the Strategic Defense Initiative by the British and by the FRG representatives that will make the development [sozdaniye] of some types of space strike weapons cheaper and more rapid.

[Agayants] An admission of the utmost cynicism.

[Beglov] In that sense, if we are going to talk about cynicism, then if one goes over to Tokyo one can quote a Japanese industrialist who said that of course we understand that this idea is connected with war: We would not like to be involved in the killing of innocent people. But just think: How can we pass up the advantages we may get from taking part in this project? Please excuse us but we cannot avoid this temptation. And the result here, you know, is like this: They exchange bows; they curtsey to the public; but in actual fact they make this shameless, crafty, hypocritical, and cynical justification of their involvement in an adventure that might cost mankind very dearly.

/9274

CSO: 5200/1303

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

23 April 86